

Entered
C
AB. 5 1917

April
in Gettysburg

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

1 47
(1917)

VOL. XLVII—NO. 1.

JANUARY, 1917.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1917

CONTENTS

I. The Reformation Quadri-centennial.....	1
By Professor J. A. Clutz, D.D.	
II. Martin Luther in the Changing Light of Four Centuries.....	20
By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
III. Melanchthon and the Lord's Supper After His Divergence from Luther.....	52
By Professor John Alfred Faulkner, D.D.	
IV. Caesar and His Soldiers.....	71
By T. B. Stork.	
V. The Theory of Evolution as Appropriated by Socialism.....	85
By Rev. A. J. Traver.	
VI. Inner Mission—Its Goal.....	99
By Rev. W. H. Feldman.	
VII. Current Theological Thought.....	120
In English. By Professor J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
In German. By Professor Abdel Ross Wentz, Ph.D.	
VIII. Review of Recent Literature.....	138
The Formula of Concord—Luther's Christmas Tree—The Challenge of the Sunday School—Life of Adolph Spaeth, D.D., LL.D.—Bible Stories to Read and Tell—The Challenge of the Future—The Mythology of All Races—R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D.—The Man of Power—Modern Messages from Great Hymns—The Undiscovered Country—Foundations of Christian Belief—The Gospel of Good Will as Revealed in Contemporary Scriptures—The Essentials of Religious Education—The Enchanted Universe—The Lord God of Elijah—Usury—Little Journeys with Martin Luther—The Books of the Pentateuch—Year Books—The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1917—Almanac for the Year 1917—Der Zionsbote Christlicher Volkskalender auf das Jahr 1917—Luther in the Light of Recent Research.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1917.

ARTICLE I.

THE REFORMATION QUADRI-CENTENNIAL.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. CLUTZ, D.D.

Much is being said and written just now about the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, which occurs during this year, 1917. Under normal conditions this anniversary would no doubt have attracted much more attention, and would have been carried out on a much grander scale, in Europe, and especially in Germany, than in this country. The Reformation was essentially a European movement. America had been discovered only fifteen years when Luther issued his world-awakening and now world-renowned challenge to the Church of Rome by nailing his Ninety-five Theses to the church door in Wittenberg, on October 31, 1517. All the great events that followed were staged in European countries and cities and towns. All the places and shrines made memorable and sacred in connection with either the heroes of the Reformation or their heroic deeds are to be found there. There live also the great mass of that mighty host who to-day are called by the name of the great Reformer, and who profess and hold the truth which he and his co-laborers gave to the world four hundred years ago.

But, alas, all Europe is torn and convulsed by the great

world-war now raging, and of the early termination of which there is so little hope at the time of writing this. Even if the war should end during the year, which may God grant, the nations that have been engaged in the titanic struggle will have other things to do and to think of than the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. They will have the terms of peace to arrange, and their desolated homes to rebuild, and their ruined industries to reconstruct or adjust to the new conditions, and practically a new civilization to develop. If the war continues, which may God forbid, then all that can be expected is more terror, and frightfulness, and bloodshed, and destruction, and tears, a growing horror of great darkness.

Hence the probabilities are that the chief celebration of this great anniversary will take place in this country. It is with this, therefore, that we are especially concerned. It will no doubt be participated in to a greater or less extent by all Protestant denominations, for all have an interest in it either as the time of their birth, or as making that birth possible at a later date. Many social and civil organizations may also take note of the event and pay tribute to the man and the movement of four centuries ago, since they are all indebted to Martin Luther and to the Reformation of which he was the chief leader for many of the greatest and most precious privileges and blessings in which they rejoice today. In fact, the whole modern world with all our boasted modern civilization, is the product of that wonderful movement which swept over Europe in the sixteenth century.

In its extent, in the interests involved, and in the results that flowed from it and that are still going on with an ever enlarging sweep of influence and blessing, the Reformation was without doubt one of the greatest movements in all history since the beginning of the Christian era. Indeed, in the judgment of many, the coming of Jesus Christ into the world and the founding of the Christian Church is the only event in all history which actually transcends the Reformation in importance and in its far-reaching results. We commonly speak of it as the

Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, but it really began long before that. If we are to find the roots of it we must go back to the teaching and preaching of Wickliff, and Huss, and Savonarola in the fifteenth century, and even farther still to the work of Meister Eckhart, the "Father of German Mysticism" in the close of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries. The work of Luther and his co-laborers in the sixteenth century was only the culmination of a movement which already had been under way and gathering force and momentum for at least two hundred years. If it had not been so Luther would probably have shared the fate of many who had preceded him, and would have ended his career in prison, or in exile, or at the stake.

We are wont to speak of the Reformation as the German Reformation. But it was not confined to Germany. It had its inception there, and for a century or more Germany remained the chief storm center. But it quickly extended southward into Switzerland, and northward into the Scandinavian countries, and westward into England and Scotland. It was thus not merely a national but a truly continental movement.

We are proud to speak of it as the Lutheran Reformation. This may be justified by the fact that Luther was the most conspicuous figure in it, and that to him and his co-workers in Germany its success was most largely due. But we must not forget those who wrought with him in other lands, as Calvin in Geneva, and Zwingli in Zurich, and John Knox in Scotland, and Cranmer and John Colet in England. Neither should we forget that out of this general movement there came eventually the various branches of the Reformed or non-Lutheran Churches which now embrace nearly half of Protestantism, and in some respects the more aggressive and influential half.

We naturally think and speak of the Reformation chiefly as a religious movement, for such it was pre-eminently. Yet it was also much more than this. It really affected every interest and activity of man, not only in that age, but in all subsequent ages down to the present time, literary, educational, social, economic, political, in-

dustrial and commercial. It was like the rising of the tides in the sea which stir to its depths the whole mass of the waters and send the great swelling waves in towards the shore until they fill every gulf, and bay, and river, and inlet along the entire coast-line. So the Reformation stirred the whole mass of the peoples throughout all Europe, from the Pope in the Vatican and the Emperor on his throne and the princes in their palaces, to the humblest peasants in their lowly places and vocations. It eventually raised the general level of human life socially, intellectually, morally and spiritually, throughout the whole civilized world. Neither has the upward impulse then given ever been lost. There have, of course, been times of retrogression and decadence, as in the rising of the tides there are reflux waves when the water seems to be receding, but the general course of development has been ever onward and upward.

It is entirely fitting, therefore, that the whole Protestant world at least should celebrate in a becoming way the quadricentennial of the Reformation, and thus give expression to their appreciation of all the benefits and blessings which are the fruits of the Reformation and the accumulation of the intervening centuries. Even the Roman Catholic Church would have ample grounds for celebrating this anniversary with gratitude and praise because of the Counter-Reformation which the Lutheran Reformation made possible and even necessary in the Catholic Church, and which has made it a different institution today from what it was at the time of the Reformation especially in those lands in which it comes into close contact with the Protestant Churches.

But naturally the Lutheran Church has a larger interest in this anniversary than the general public, and a larger interest than any other ecclesiastical body. As Lutherans we can hardly make too much of it. It would argue a most deplorable lack of appreciation of the work of Luther and his co-laborers of the sixteenth century, and prove us wholly unworthy of our glorious heritage, if we did not do all that we can as a Church to refresh our own knowledge of the Reformation and to quicken our

gratitude for what it accomplished, and also to call the attention of others to those great events and to their meaning for the whole world.

But if this quadricentennial celebration is to be really profitable to us as individuals and as a Church, if it is to be made really worth while, so that at the close of the year 1917 we shall find ourselves farther on than at the beginning, we must try to gain some clear conception of the purposes and spirit which are to dominate us in all our meetings, and in all our speaking and writing throughout the year.

Just what these purposes and this spirit should be, it may not be so easy to determine. No two of us would be likely to agree entirely. Much will depend on the stand-point from which we approach the subject and the special interests which appeal to us most strongly. There will, however, be some broad and general lines on which it would seem that all ought to be able to work in harmony.

1. Certainly, all will agree that one object of the celebration should be the giving of *information*. Our own people need this information. The great majority of them, it is to be feared, are woefully ignorant concerning the most primary historical facts connected with the Reformation. Still fewer of them, we suspect, know anything about the principles involved in that great movement, or the real results obtained.

The writer had occasion, some months ago, to make a test of this in a company of thirty-two people who, from their associations and training and general advantages, might have been expected to know far more about these things than the average membership of our churches. Only twelve of the thirty-two knew both the place and the date of Luther's birth. Only two could give the names of both the father and the mother of Luther. Only nineteen could tell why Luther became a monk, and nearly all of these laid the emphasis on the external and immediate occasion of his taking this step, the storm and the fright and his consequent vow to St. Anne, rather than upon his desire to find rest for a troubled conscience burdened with a sense of sin. Only seven could give the

name of the order of monks which he joined. Only ten were able to name three of Luther's chief literary contributions to the progress of the Reformation, and only seven of these mentioned the translation of the Bible into the German vernacular as one of these. Only ten had ever read the entire Augsburg Confession, and only fourteen could tell why it is called the Augsburg Confession. Not one of the number could give the names of three of Luther's chief co-workers in Germany, though twenty-eight named Melanchthon as one of them. Only six could give the year of Luther's death, and five of the number did not know what was the special abuse of the Church of Rome against which Luther aimed his Ninety-five Theses.

If any of our readers are disposed to think that these thirty-two people were especially stupid or ill-informed, we would suggest that they make a similar test, without previous warning, of any chance company of Lutheran laymen that they may find available for the purpose, say an adult Bible class, or a Young People's Society, or the persons present at a mid-week prayer service. Hand to them a series of questions like the following, and see how many of them can answer them correctly:

1. Name two "Reformers before the Reformation" who preceded Luther by about a century.
2. Give the place and date of Luther's birth.
3. What were the names of his father and mother?
4. Why did Luther become a monk?
5. To what order of monks did he belong?
6. Why is October 31 known in the calendar of the Church Year as "Reformation Day?"
7. Against what special abuse of the Church of Rome were Luther's Ninety-five Theses directed?
8. What was Luther's chief literary contribution to the Reformation?
9. When and why did Luther prepare his Larger and Smaller Catechisms?
10. Which is the most popular of all of Luther's hymns?

11. What was Luther's reply when he was asked to recant at the Diet of Worms?
12. Why was Luther concealed in the Wartburg castle for a season?
13. Why is the Augsburg Confession so called?
14. How many articles does it have, and how are they divided?
15. Have you ever read all the articles of the Augsburg Confession?
16. What is meant by "the formal principle," and what by "the material principle" of the Reformation?
17. What great doctrine did Luther call "the doctrine of a standing or a falling Church?"
18. Name three of Luther's principal co-workers in Germany.
19. What German prince was Luther's chief friend and protector?
20. Name three of Luther's contemporaries who were leaders of the Reformation in other countries.
21. What was the chief point of difference between Luther and Zwingli at the Marburg Conference?
22. In what year did Luther die?
23. Mention some of the results of the Reformation which we still enjoy.
24. What is the relative strength of the Lutheran Church among Protestants throughout the world?
25. What is the relative strength of the Lutheran Church among Protestants in the United States?

It may be said that the knowledge of these facts is not essential to salvation. This is of course true, but it is important. It is essential to efficiency in church work. How can our people be expected to have any warm love for their Church, or to show any intelligent devotion to it, or any great activity in its work, if they are ignorant of such primary facts concerning its history? These and such as these are just the facts that will be repeated over and over again in the addresses made, and in the articles written, and in the books published during this quadricentennial year, and we shall be greatly surprised and disappointed if at its close our people generally are not

very much better informed as to them than they were at the beginning.

Of the mistaken conceptions or crass ignorance of the Lutheran Church and its history and teachings among the other denominations there is no need to write at length. There are very few Lutherans, certainly very few Lutheran ministers, who have not been confronted and made indignant by it again and again. Sometimes it may be our own fault. As a Church we have often been too modest and deferential, sometimes too apologetic. Sometimes we have been too exclusive and selfish and self-complacent. No wonder we have remained unknown or have been misunderstood. Sometimes this ignorance of our Church among non-Lutherans is the result of circumstances over which neither they nor we have had any control.

But whatever may have been the cause of such ignorance or misunderstanding in the past, there will surely be less of it, or at least less excuse for it, in the future. If the plans projected are carried out there will be so much information given to the public during this year by means of public meetings, and addresses, and pageants, and books published, and articles in the religious and secular papers, that there will no longer be any excuse for any even fairly intelligent man or woman of this generation ever to say to us again: "Methodists we know, and Baptists we know, and Presbyterians we know, but who are ye?"

2. *Conservation* is another result to be aimed at and expected from the quadricentennial celebration of the Reformation. The rehearsal of the history of the Reformation, and the bringing out into clearer light of the principles and doctrines that were the chief dynamics in the movement, and the setting in order of the mighty results that flowed from it, can hardly help giving us as Lutherans a fuller and richer appreciation of the great cost and the priceless value of our Lutheran heritage and kindling within us a new determination to preserve it undiminished and uncorrupted for ourselves and for future generations.

We would be glad to believe that this would be no difficult task in this the twentieth century of the Christian era, and after four hundred years of Protestantism. But we know better. We cannot thus deceive ourselves in face of the facts with which we are all too familiar. It is only too evident that some of the strongest denominations of Protestantism are being honey-combed with the new rationalism of the day that parades under the form either of a destructive "Higher Criticism," or of a so-called "New Theology." The two generally go together each supporting and reinforcing the other. The one strikes at the integrity of the Scriptures, and the other at the integrity of the faith. The success of either must prove fatal to some of the most important and most cherished truths and principles of the Reformation.

One of these is the doctrine that the Bible is the inspired word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practice. This is usually spoken of as "the formal principle" of the Reformation, though the term has been objected to by some. It voiced the protest of Luther and his co-workers against the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church that tradition was co-ordinate with the Holy Scriptures, and that the Church as represented by the Pope and the Councils was even superior to them. It was to this principle that Luther appealed at the Diet of Worms when he declared that he would not recant any of his writings unless they were proved false out of the Holy Scriptures, because it was evident that the Pope and the Councils had often erred, ending with the famous words: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise: God help me. Amen."

Upon this principle the Lutheran Church has always stood and still stands, by the side of its great leader. But this is just one of the truths that is being most bitterly assailed at the present day. True, the attack comes from an entirely different source, and is of quite a different character. It is not the Roman Catholic Church which we have to fear today, but a pretentious and destructive critical scholarship within the ranks of Protestantism itself. It is not tradition, or Pope, or Council

that this new enemy would make co-ordinate with the Word of God, or even superior to it, but human reason and experience. These, we are told, are to be accepted as authoritative not only for the interpretation of the word of God, but also for the determination of what is the word of God. According to this teaching the Bible is not to be regarded as the word of God, but only as containing the word of God. And if we are to be guided by what is so boastfully called "the accepted results of modern scholarship," we must believe that it contains very little that is really and truly the word of God. Instead of being a divinely inspired revelation it is little more than a human compilation or invention. Instead of being an "infallible rule of faith and practice," as the Reformers taught, and as the Lutheran Church has always believed, it is an exceedingly fallible book, full of myths and fables and folk-lore that must be taken with many grains of salt or entirely discredited.

The other pillar of truth upon which the Reformers builded is the doctrine of justification by faith alone, without any admixture of human powers, or merits, or works. This has been called "the material principle" of the Reformation, though not without protest from some as in the case of "the formal principle." But in neither case has there ever been any protest against the truth involved, or against the place given to that truth in the Reformation, but only against the use of the terms "formal" and "material." The Reformers really leaned more heavily on this doctrine of justification by faith alone than on the other doctrine of the supremacy and infallibility of the Scriptures. Luther pronounced it "the doctrine of a standing or a falling Church." It is given confessional statement in Article IV of the Augsburg Confession. In the Smalcald Articles it is declared that "Of this article nothing can be yielded or surrendered, even though heaven and earth and all things should sink to ruin."

This doctrine is being assailed today also, indirectly if not directly, by the denial of the doctrines of original sin and total depravity, and by the denial of the true deity

of Jesus Christ. Man is naturally good, we are told, and all that is necessary for his salvation is better teaching, an improved environment and a resolute will. Men are to be saved by character rather than by grace. If the old term, justification by faith, is used, it is with a new meaning. It is not faith in the atoning death of Christ that brings justification and peace, but faith in the love, and mercy, and all-abounding goodness of God as the Father of all men.

The deity of Jesus Christ is another doctrine that is imperiled at the present time. It is true that the Reformers had no special controversy with the Roman Catholic theologians over this point. The latter made no objection to Article III of the Augsburg Confession in which the Reformers set forth their faith that "the Word, that is, the Son of God, took unto him man's nature, in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, so that there are two natures, the divine and the human, inseparably joined together in unity of person; one Christ, true God and true man: who was born of the Virgin Mary, truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, that he might reconcile the Father unto us, and might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men," etc.

But the deity of Christ assumed a new significance and a new importance in Lutheran theology because of its relation to the doctrine of justification by faith. It became fundamental for all Lutheran faith and teaching. It is often said that Lutheran theology is Christo-centric. It all revolves about the person and work of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word. If Christ had not been "true God and true man" as taught in Article III of the Augsburg Confession, He could never have "satisfied for our sins" as taught in Article IV.

Now, however, we are being told that we must not think of Christ as "God and man" but as "God in man." This may not seem at first to make very much difference. But it does make a tremendous difference. It makes all the difference between a divine and a human Savior. These new teachers may and do still speak of Christ as

divine, but when they are pressed for an explanation of His divinity it is found that they mean nothing more than that God was immanent in Christ just as He is immanent in all men, and in all things for that matter. If Christ was more divine than other men, as they grant that He was, it is only because for some reason God was able to manifest Himself in Him more fully than in other men. The difference was wholly one of degree, not of kind, so that after all we have in Christ only a human Savior and not a divine Savior at all such as we find in the teaching of Luther and of all Lutheran theology. The Virgin birth is denied by these new teachers. The miracles are explained away or interpreted allegorically. The bodily resurrection of Jesus is called in question, and of course His bodily ascension and His eternal session at God's right hand. In fact the whole structure of the older Christology is undermined and must eventually fall to the ground, if this new teaching be true.

We cannot go on to refer to other fundamental doctrines that are being assailed today by the New Theology, or by a destructive Historical Criticism. Neither is it necessary. We have said enough to illustrate the danger that threatens us. The point we are trying to emphasize is this, that in the celebration of this four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation we ought to aim at, and expect, such a fresh and full statement of the truths and principles of our Lutheran faith as will give to all our people a clear understanding of them and of their importance, a firm grasp of their truth and reality, and beget in them a determined purpose to hold and defend them against all the assaults of the enemy. This is what we mean by conservation as one of the results of the Quadracentennial Celebration.

We have been wont to congratulate ourselves as Lutherans that our Church, at least in this country, has been affected very little as yet by these modern errors. This is probably true, and it certainly is something for which we should be profoundly grateful. But we can hardly expect to escape the contagion much longer except by fortifying our people against it. These false doctrines

are being preached in many of the pulpits of the denominations. They are being taught in many of the schools both academic and theological, and not a few of our young people are attending these non-Lutheran schools. They permeate much of the literature of the day, books and periodicals. They are most insidiously set forth in a good deal of our modern popular fiction. The only way to save our people from being led astray by them is by making them so familiar with the true doctrines and with the arguments supporting them, that they will be proof against error and falsehood. No finer opportunity for this could be desired than is furnished by this Quadricentennial Celebration.

3. A third thing to be sought and expected from our Quadricentennial Celebration is *inspiration*. This turns our faces towards the future. Hitherto, in our discussion, we have been looking back, now we are to look forward. We have been speaking largely of what has been now we are to think of what is to come. It would be a great mistake to confine our attention to the past, or even to the present. History should never be treated as a Morris chair in which we may lounge and take our ease. It should never be turned into a downy couch on which we may lie and lull ourselves to slumber by the monotonous recitation of the great deeds and the great achievements of our fathers of the sixteenth century. Rather should it become a stimulus to rouse us to action and to stir us to new endeavor. We need not, like Paul, "forget those things which are behind," but we should, like him, ever be "stretching forward to the things which are before." Even Paul did not forget the great history of his people, or lose sight of his obligation to the generations which had preceded him. But he realized that he could not rest in these and be content, that he had his own work to do, his own responsibilities to meet, his own mission to fulfill. It is the same with us as a Church.

Our Quadricentennial Celebration should inspire us, first, with a true and high denominational pride and loyalty. There is a pride that is evil and debasing, whether found in an individual or in a Church. It is cold and

hard and selfish. It holds itself aloof from all who do not belong to its particular class, and looks down on them with disdain and contempt. It was of this kind of pride that the wise man wrote: "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." We do not want any of this in our churches. So there is a loyalty that is only another and politer name for prejudice and bigotry. It is rigid and uncompromising even in things in themselves indifferent, and will show no tolerance and listen to no argument for any departure from itself even in the slightest particular. This is likewise a very unlovely and unchristian thing and should be neither cultivated nor tolerated in our churches.

But there is a pride that is noble and ennobling. It grows out of a deep and pervading gratitude and joy, and produces a sense of pious exaltation, because of the manifestations of God's favor and goodness. There is also a loyalty that can see and recognize all the good in others and bid them God-speed in their work, and yet have such a high appreciation of our own great history and heritage as Lutherans, that it prompts us always to cherish our historical Lutheran faith, and follow our historical forms of worship and methods of work, as the truest and best for us whatever may be the case with others. This is not only the way of true loyalty but it is also the way of largest growth and richest service. In nature, every plant and tree and animal functions best and attains its highest development only by remaining true to its type. In minor things it may change in order to adapt itself to its environment, but it must retain all the essential characteristics of its family or species. If it does not it will grow weak and sickly, will fail to produce "after its kind," and will eventually perish from the earth. So a great historic Church like ours can function best, and most surely reach its highest development and fulfill its God-given mission in the world, by remaining true to its type and thus preserving its identity from generation to generation. In minor things there may be variation and adaptation, but in all essential characteristics, in all those things which really differentiate it from the other Pro-

testant Churches and give to it an individuality of its own, it must be true to its historic origin and development, or lose its identity and forfeit its right to exist as a separate organization. Sometimes our people, and even some of our Lutheran ministers, forget this, and seem to think that our Church will grow more rapidly and attain to a larger usefulness by surrendering all its distinctive doctrines and forms of worship and methods of work, and becoming as much like its neighbors as possible. This may sometimes have brought a temporary and superficial show of advantage, but in the end it has always proved itself a mistake, and has failed. In all the denominations the churches that have had the most substantial growth, and the most solid prosperity, and have done the most for the glory of God and for the saving of the world, are those that have been most loyal to their type. No Church can have more incentives to such loyalty in its history than ours. It will certainly be one of the results of our Quadricentennial Celebration to make this fact clear and to give it all due emphasis.

If nothing more were to be accomplished by the celebration, this alone would make it worth while. A genuine and warm church loyalty would include everything else that is important, or make sure that it would follow in due time. But the committees having the program in charge are wisely emphasizing some other things which are to be kept in mind as worthy aims in this quadricentennial year.

One of these is the circulation of Lutheran literature for the instruction of our own people and for the information of all who can be induced to read it. Many new books will be written and published dealing with all phases of our history, and doctrines, and practical work. An extended series of most interesting and instructive articles are being prepared for our church papers, and these will be published in the papers of other denominations, and even in the secular papers, as far as possible. Special stress is to be laid in this connection on the more general circulation of the various church papers in the homes of our people. The editors of these periodicals

have adopted the slogan: "A Lutheran Church paper in every Lutheran Home by the close of 1917." They may not accomplish this, but any fair approximation to its realization will be of untold benefit to the Church. There is no more efficient pastoral assistant, or stimulant to increased interest and activity in all the work of the Church than the weekly visits of a good, loyal church paper to the homes of our people.

Another thing to be aimed at is the better endowment and equipment of our church schools, especially our colleges and theological seminaries. As Lutherans we have been accustomed to speak with pride of the fact that our Church was "born in a university." But we have hardly proved ourselves worthy of this noble origin in this country where we do not have a single university that was founded by Lutheran money, or that is conducted under Lutheran auspices. True, our Year Book reports two institutions that bear the name of university. But, however excellent schools they may be within their proper province, neither one of them has an endowment, or an equipment, or an organization to justify the title. We have many most excellent colleges and seminaries, but every one of them is more or less handicapped in its work, and especially in competition with the institutions of other Churches, and the undenominational and secular schools, by its limited endowment and equipment. We need to blush when we say it but not a single Lutheran college or seminary in the United States is able to report as much as half a million dollars of endowment. Only four even nearly approach that amount. One institution has a little more than half a million, but this covers both the collegiate and the theological departments.

This ought not so to be. There may have been good and sufficient reasons for the poverty of our schools in the past. For many years the Lutheran Church was a poor and struggling one as compared with a number of our sister Churches. But this is no longer the case. We may not be counted a rich Church even now. We have very few multi-millionaires. We have no Rockefellers, or Carnegies, or Morgans, or Leland Stanfords, or men

of that class. This may be no discredit to us. But we do have the ability to care for our schools much better than we have done. As a people we have shared in the general prosperity of the last half century since the Civil War. We have scores and hundreds of men and women who are able to give and to give largely, and who ought to do so. If they cannot give millions they can give thousands, and tens and hundreds of thousands. We trust that they will be stimulated to this during this Quadracentennial Celebration. We can never adequately endow or equip our schools so long as their presidents or agents must spend their time and strength, and wear out their lives, going about the Church collecting small amounts from the rank and file of our people, sometimes even from the Sunday Schools, and Women's Societies, and other benevolent organizations of the Church. We would not despise these small contributions. In fact, we highly value them because we want all our people to be interested in our institutions and to have a share in the joy and blessing of maintaining them. But for adequate endowment and equipment, if we are ever to have this, we must depend on the large gifts of a relatively few whom God has exceptionally blessed and prospered, and to whom He has entrusted large wealth, and upon whom He has laid great responsibility. We trust that this end may be attained also during this anniversary year, or at least largely furthered.

Even a larger conception of the duty and responsibility of our Lutheran Church finds expression in the motto adopted by the Central Anniversary Committee that represents the three general bodies, the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South: "The Celebration of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century to Hasten the Transformation of the Twentieth Century." This calls our attention to the world-mission of the Lutheran Church, and this is well. Too long and too much, perhaps, we have been accustomed in this country to think and speak of the mission of the Lutheran Church to Lutherans. We have forgotten that the Reformation was a world movement. We have forgotten

that it was a movement like the founding of the Christian Church in the first three centuries of the Christian era. It was in fact the recovery or re-birth of evangelical Christianity which had been corrupted and obscured by the errors, and false teaching, and superstitious practices of the Church of Rome. The same truths and principles which wrought such a mighty change then are needed today to oppose error, to correct false teaching, to right the wrongs of society, and to work a transformation which will be like the coming of the kingdom of God in the world. This is too large a subject for discussion in this paper, but we should ever keep it in the background of all our meetings, and addresses, and writing, and even of our thinking, during this great anniversary year.

4. Still a fourth result to be hoped for from the Quadracentennial Celebration remains to be considered, that of *unification*. Not much has been said about this, and we do not mean to dwell on it at any great length here. It may be best not to say too much about it. Sometimes the less such things are talked about the sooner they are likely to come to pass. Many Lutherans are very shy of all talk about union, especially organic union. We may not be ready for this yet. It may well be that we will never be ready for an organic union of all in this country who bear the Lutheran name. Our doctrinal differences are not very great, but the linguistic, and national, and traditional differences may be too many and too pronounced ever to be entirely overcome.

But certainly this anniversary ought to bring us closer together. It ought to remove misunderstandings and misapprehensions. It ought to set into the foreground of our thought of each other the things in which we are agreed, and push into the background the things in which we differ. It ought to bring out into the clear the distinctive family traits in all the great Lutheran bodies, and awaken a new and stronger consciousness of family likeness and a spirit of genuine brotherhood. Why should Lutherans stand aloof from each other and look at each other askance, because they do not all think and speak and act exactly alike in every minutia of doctrine

or polity, or in all the forms of worship or methods of work? The members of a family are not all alike. They may differ quite widely in appearance and manner, or in temper and disposition; still they constitute one family, and if they have the true family spirit they will recognize the family relation and live and work together as brethren. Why should not we as Lutherans do the same thing?

If we cannot unite organically in the same general body we can at least recognize each other as brethren of the same household of faith, and co-operate and help each other in many ways. Many enterprises and much work are common to us all. That is, we are all engaged in the same line of work, such as publication, and education, and Home and Foreign Missions, and Inner Mission work, and the founding and maintenance of eleemosynary institutions of various kinds. Co-operation in these would mean not only a great saving of energy and money, but it would also tend to secure largely increased results. Thus we would be doing at least something towards bringing about the answer to our Lord's Prayer that all His disciples may be one even as He and the Father are one.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE II.

MARTIN LUTHER IN THE CHANGING LIGHT OF
FOUR CENTURIES.¹

BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

Just four hundred years have passed since the German Reformation began and Martin Luther stepped upon the stage of world-history. Throughout this period the influence of the great Reformer has never ceased to be felt and his personality is still a determining factor in the evangelical Christianity of today. But during these four centuries there have been many changes in the point of view from which the world has looked at men and things. There have been many variations in the light that men have flashed upon their heroes of the past. As with other figures of heroic stature, so with Martin Luther,—his life and work have been very unevenly estimated in the centuries that have passed since he first attracted the attention of the world. Each age has felt his influence in its own peculiar way. And our own day is not without its distinctive contribution to the estimates that are placed upon the work of the German Reformer.

It may not be amiss, therefore, in this quadricentennial year to take a turn through the history of Protestantism to see with what a variety of color Luther has appeared in the changing light of these four centuries. Luther's varied career during this quadricentenium is really a longitudinal section of the history of thought for the period. It is interesting to note how each distinctive period in the history of these four centuries of Protestantism has translated Luther into the language of its own special type of thought. Then, too, such a review may help us to understand the divergence of opinion

¹ This paper was read at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Church History, held in New York City, December 26, 1916.

that is manifested in various quarters today concerning this man's relation to the modern world.²

PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION.

Already in his own day Luther had become the object of love and of hate. In the short perspective of a few years men began to see something of the significance of his work. In the burning of the Papal Bull in 1520 the issue was squarely joined and men had to take sides either for Luther or against him. From all ranks and interests came his admirers. The changes that he effected were so far-reaching in their consequences and so varied

² This paper can deal only with Luther's career among Protestants. It might indeed be an interesting and profitable exercise also to trace the history of the Roman Catholic attitude towards Luther, from Eck and Cochlaeus to Denifle and Grisar. It is doubtful whether much progress could be noted in the Catholic appreciation of Luther during the past four centuries, because that branch of Christendom has persistently closed itself against Luther's influence, particularly his religious influence. And the rich materials that have been gathered by Hegemann ("Luther im katholischen Urteil," Munich, 1906) indicate no serious effort to comprehend Luther or his movement. At any rate, the limitations of our space will not permit the treatment of that part of our subject here.

It is different with the non-Lutheran branches of Protestantism, even with those whose historical beginnings Luther himself opposed in the sixteenth century. They have for the most part moved with the general line of progress in the appreciation of Luther. But of course our sketch can be most easily accomplished and most clearly illustrated in each case by reference to that branch of Protestantism which bears Luther's own name, more particularly those who have lived in Luther's own land.

The information for this sketch is gathered from such secondary sources as:

- Eckart, "Luther im Urteile bedeutender Männer."
- Dorner, "Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie."
- Boehmer, "Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung."
- Stephan, "Luther in den Wandlungen seiner Kirche."
- McGiffert, "Protestant Thought before Kant."
- Moore, "Christian Thought since Kant."
- Ritschl, "Geschichte des Pietismus."
- Gass, "Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik."
- Lichtenberger, "History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century."
- Seeberg, "Die Kirche Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert."
- Troeltsch, "Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit."
- Loofs, "Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit."
- Various articles in Hauck's "Realencyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche."

in their character that men of all classes hailed him with acclaim and brought him their tributes of love and esteem.

Many were attracted to the man by his genial personality. Thus Mosellan, one of the scholars of Leipsic, who had come to know Luther personally at the time of the disputation there, says of him in a letter to a friend: "In his life he is kindly and courteous. There is nothing stoical or supercilious about him. He knows how to conduct himself under all circumstances. In society he is gleeful, witty, animated, and always happy. His face is always bright and cheerful, however direful the threats of his enemies. So that it would be hard to believe that this man could undertake such serious things without the favor of God." The same sort of testimony comes from a multitude of other witnesses, people who were personally acquainted with the man Luther. The picturesque element of his character, the biting force of his words, and the dauntless courage of his deeds, while they condemned him severely among his enemies, nevertheless commended him the more heartily to his friends. Throughout his public life Luther manifested a capacity for personal friendship, a talent for binding men to himself by strong personal ties, that is unique among the great Reformers and with few parallels in history. His personality attracted and impressed people with a sense of his extraordinary character and his extraordinary mission.

Some were attracted to the Reformer by his theological views. Among his intellectual admirers, outside the circle of his immediate associates, was no less a person than John Calvin himself, the founder of the other branch of the Reformation. Calvin regarded Luther as his most influential teacher and referred to him as "that distinguished servant of God." Zwingli, too, was drawn by Luther's theology and spoke of him as "the ablest champion of God and the best student of Scriptures that has appeared on earth for a thousand years."

But the circle of Luther's theological friends and intellectual admirers in his own day was small as compared with the number of those who were drawn to him on other grounds. The masses of the people, who had no theological training, did not stop to ponder the theological implications of Luther's words and deeds. This was reserved for a select group of theologians and for those who through their own inner experience, similar to that of Luther, had come to realize the depth of his religious struggle and the wealth of his evangelical faith.

But the masses of Luther's own day did realize that in him the Christian world had one of its most forceful personalities. They did understand that the might of his personality lay in the very vigor of his faith so firmly grounded in the Redeemer and through Him in a gracious God. They did appreciate the fact that in this extraordinary man with his intimate communion with God and his far-reaching principles, Roman Catholic Christianity was for once baffled and beaten because it stood before a religious superior. Those whose personal piety was not strong enough to lead them to rejoice in the religious worth of this man rejoiced at least in their liberation from Papal tyranny, from the dictates of foreigners, and from the tutelage of the priests.

In his work Luther gathered together into one strand the scattered threads of the national and religious longings of his day. Many and varied were the motives that drew men to his cause. Some admired him for religious reasons, some for patriotic reasons, some for scientific and cultural reasons, and some for economic reasons. Sometimes men's admiration for the hero rested simply on an indefinite and unreasoned instinct. So that Luther's name and Luther's personality were more prominent on the banner of the Reformation than any particular article of faith. Says Döllinger, the Roman Catholic historian of a generation ago, speaking of Luther's standing among his own people: "There never was a German who understood his nation so intuitively, and in turn was so thoroughly apprehended by his own people, so completely absorbed by them, we might say, as was the case

with the Augustinian monk of Wittenberg. The spirit and temper of the Germans were as completely under his control as a lyre in the hands of a master musician."

Abundant evidence of Luther's personal popularity in his own generation is to be found in both the popular and the learned literature of his day. Albrecht Dürer, the celebrated artist of that time, in his diary refers to Luther as "the God-inspired man who has helped me out of great tribulations." Hans Sachs, the poet, sings of "the Wittenberg nightingale, whose song is heard in every vale." Michael Stiefel, the mathematician, lauds him as the angel of the book of Revelation (14:6) who flies through the heavens proclaiming an everlasting gospel. And some were so extravagant in their enthusiasm for him as to ascribe to him qualities that transcend humanity and practically make him an object of worship.

Of course Luther had his personal enemies in his own day just as he has had his defamers and detractors ever since that day. The frightful slanders of the Roman Catholics, by which they sought to blacken his name and disparage his cause, began already in Luther's life-time. This was involved in the very nature of the case and does not occasion surprise. Then, too, the fanatical reformers and the anabaptists took offense at Luther's methods and at his attitude towards them. They poured out violent invective against his person and accused him of soft living, of papal pretensions, and of having betrayed a holy cause into the hands of princes and their worldly government. Some of the humanists also, notably Erasmus, who had hoped to regenerate the world by polishing the intellects of men, found no satisfaction in Luther's methods and principles, and gradually developed personal animosity towards him.

But all such speedily lost their influence upon the course of events in that age. For during the active days of the Wittenberg monk, almost the entire spiritual life of his nation gathered about his personality. Those who had their faces set towards the future flocked for the most part to his banner. Failing to do that, they forfeited their leadership or else became the heads of de-

spised "sects" that were destined to remain in comparative insignificance for almost two centuries.

But the heyday of the German Reformation passed and with it Luther's personal popularity declined. The high tide of his popularity occurred in the early twenties, say from the Leipsic Disputation in 1519 to the middle of the third decade. With the outbreak of the Peasants' War in 1525 his favor among the lower classes began to ebb somewhat. For in that social outbreak Luther expressed his lack of confidence in the common man. He stormed against the violence of the peasants and cordially espoused the cause of the princes. This in the end was not without its advantages for Luther's movement, but certainly so far as Luther's personal standing is concerned his attitude in the Peasants' War made him forfeit much of the love with which up to that time he had been regarded by the masses. With this incident, therefore, the Lutheran Reformation entered upon a new phase of its development and the year 1525 draws a sharp line of division between the "earlier" and the "later" Luther as he has been known to subsequent ages.

PERIOD OF ORTHODOXY.

Immediately after Luther's death, efforts were made to form conclusive estimates of his personality and of his work. But of course these efforts did not succeed. The funeral addresses of Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, and Cölius, the *vita Lutheri* with which Melanchthon prefaced the second volume of the Wittenberg edition of Luther's works, and the *historia Lutheri* of Luther's physician Ratzeberger, only reflect the personal impressions of these admiring friends; they do not indicate any thorough-going appreciation of his historical significance. And the earliest historians of the Reformation, Myconius, Spalatin, and Sleidan did not sound the depths of Luther's spirit or discern the epochal character of the Reformation as a movement. The events themselves were still too near for their proper estimation.

A slight degree of progress in the objective characterization of the German Reformer is marked by the famous series of seventeen sermons preached by John Mathesius in 1562-1564. Mathesius, too, was a personal acquaintance of Luther's. It cannot be said that he understood the real heart of his hero or the true import of his work. But he gives a chronological narrative of the events in Luther's life which has served as an important source of information for all subsequent biographers. His account abounds in terms of endearment and of extravagant admiration. He dwells upon Luther's humility of spirit, his keen sense of sinfulness, and the joyfulness of his implicit faith. He regards the Reformer as a great Prophet and places him in a class with men like Moses and Elijah and Paul. At the same time he is not blind to the very human qualities and the faults of his hero, but he seriously attempts a psychological explanation of the man's character with its many sides. The most important achievement of Luther Mathesius finds in his recovery of the pure doctrine, and herein Mathesius is typical of the second half of the sixteenth century. He marks the transition from the age of personal acquaintanceship with Luther to the age of the Protestant schoolmen.

For the next century brought a period of sharp theological controversy and consequent doctrinal crystallization. It was the age of neo-scholasticism, often called the age of orthodoxy. Precise theological formulation was the order of the day. The Church was now regarded as a school for the teaching of sound doctrine. The most important result of the sixteenth century Reformation was found in the rediscovery of the primitive Gospel and the purification of Christian doctrine. The chief merit of Martin Luther was seen in his restoration of the true Catholic faith and his heroic struggle against theological error. Thus under the epigonus spirit of the seventeenth century, the popular conception of Luther is changed from that of a vigorous prophet of the living faith to that of a huge Professor of Dogmatics. The title of prophet continues indeed to be applied to him but the spirit of the prophet is completely gone from the picture.

The picture of Luther which the student would draw from the literature of the Protestant scholasticism of the seventeenth century is a peculiarly distorted one. The wrong features are in the foreground. The wrong elements are emphasized. Incidents and qualities which in reality were only accidents in Luther's character or limitations in his personality, tenacious heritages of the past or necessary products of his struggle with the Catholics and the radicals, are here painted as the distinctive characteristics of the man and of his work. There was no genuine effort to comprehend the real mission of the man, no attempt to analyze his real power. The theory was preconceived and the facts were forced to fit. There was zeal enough on behalf of the Reformer, but it was zeal without knowledge, a zeal that spent itself in cataloguing his superficial merits and in stringing out his individual achievements. There was not the slightest intimation anywhere that Luther stood in the forefront of a movement by which the Christian religion entered upon a new stage of its development.

To judge from the frequent mention of Luther's name and the many references to his work in the age of Protestant scholasticism one might think that his spirit ruled the age. But as a matter of fact the age laid all its emphasis upon Luther's individual words and deeds, upon externalities of all kinds, and received very little impress of his personality. His message was not apprehended. His views were not seriously studied. His writings were not read. It is a significant fact that after the Wittenberg and Jena editions of Luther's works had been issued and reprinted several times during the second half of the sixteenth century, with the year 1600 the demand for the works of the Reformer suddenly ceased and did not appear again until far into the eighteenth century. It is true a new edition of ten volumes was issued at Altenburg in 1661-1664. But this was a very incomplete edition, was published by order of the Altenburg Count Frederick William, was edited by his court preacher, Sagittarius, and found very little sale. Its publication, therefore, did not indicate any real demand for the writings of Luther.

Luther was praised and glorified in the literature of the day. His honor was stamped on coins and carved on houses. He was magnified to heroic stature and saintliness, and was classed among the prophets and apostles of Bible times. But he was always translated into the spirit of scholasticism and orthodoxy. Had he not recovered and proclaimed and spread abroad the precious system of pure doctrine? Had he not triumphed over the Pope and forced the strangle-hold of the priests who had held the pure doctrine in bondage? That there were contradictions among Luther's own theological views does not seem to have occurred to the Protestant schoolmen. Were there not in his works proof-passages a-plenty for any proposition of sound doctrine that needed to be maintained? That Luther's theological positions did not in all cases coincide with the dogmas of Lutheran Orthodoxy was not discovered until the following century. Sufficient unto the day was to dogmatize and to systematize, to collect and to collate.

The greatest dogmaticians of the day claimed to be the direct successors of Luther, and this claim was generally conceded by their contemporaries. Leonhard Hutter received the honorary title "redonatus Lutherus." His book entitled "A Grammar of the German Language Collected from Luther's German Bible and from His Other Books" held sway in both the Protestant and the Catholic schools through most of the seventeenth century. He was a staunch controversialist for Luther and against Melanchthon and the Reformed, but like all the other theologians of this scholastic age, he employed the method of loci, of which Melanchthon himself had set the example. So there was no demand for an organic comprehension of Luther's theological system.

Thus Luther has become the heroic champion of sound doctrine. His own beautiful emblem, expressing the very heart of the Gospel, has fallen into forgetfulness, and in the Luther coins of the day he is represented as holding a burning light over an open Bible. Probably no single verse was a greater favorite in the seventeenth century than this:

Wird vergehen nimmermehr."

"Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr

On a house that was built just three years before the century began, the verse occurs in this form:

"Gottes Wort und Luthers Lehr

Vergehet nun und nimmermehr

Und ob's gleick bisse noch so sehr

Die Calvinisten an ihr Ehr."

And one of the coins epitomizes the sentiment of the age in these words: "Gross was er im Leben, grösser im Reden, der Grösste aber im Lehren."

One of the stragglers of this age of Protestant Orthodoxy was John Albert Fabricius, Professor in Helmstedt. His last work was his *Centifolium Lutheranum*, Hamburg, 1728 and 1730. This is a systematic bibliography of all Luther literature and of all incidental references to Luther in the writings of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is topically arranged and uniformly disposed. Its two hundred chapters cover more than nine hundred pages of disconnected quotations concerning Luther's life, his personal qualities, his achievements, his exemplary positions, and so forth. This work is a faithful reflection of the spirit of the seventeenth century which, so far as Luther is concerned, was an age of the Epigoni, an age that fairly apotheosized the hero of the preceding century, an age of zeal without knowledge, an age of blind devotion that brought forth lifeless catalogues and excerpt quotations cut to order but did not penetrate to the living heart and the glowing spirit of the man.

PERIOD OF PIETISM.

In the next century, the century immediately preceding Kant, two distinctive types of thought run side by side, Pietism and Rationalism. In England, the rationalistic movement was somewhat older than the pietistic; in Germany the order was the reverse. The pietistic movement originated in Germany and spread to England

where it received its most striking expression in the great evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. The rationalistic movement originated in England and spread to the continent, in Germany taking the name of illuminism (die Aufklärung).

Both the pietists of Germany and the evangelicals of England claimed to be in accord with the true spirit and teaching of Martin Luther. Luther no longer received that abject obeisance as a doctrinal authority which he had received in the preceding period, but there was a distinct consciousness of spiritual relationship with the great Reformer. And while there was a one-sided emphasis upon certain aspects of his life and work, nevertheless it is clear that the pietists approached the real heart of Martin Luther much more nearly than the schoolmen had done.

The pietists based their religious life upon their inner experience. Herein they could take Luther as an example, for the very force of his protest grew out of the inner necessity of his spiritual life. By the practical nature of their religion the pietists led men back from dogma to the Bible and laid new emphasis on the personal elements in Christianity. Instead of faith in the doctrine of Christ's Person and Work, they insisted upon faith in the living form of our Lord. Now these are the very features which would lead men to an understanding not only of Luther's Christianity, his work and his teachings, but also of his personality and his inmost spirit.

We are not surprised, therefore, to find men during this period zealously reading Luther's works, and not merely reading about him and cataloguing quotations concerning him and gathering disconnected excerpts from his writings. There was a real demand now for his works themselves. As over against the single poor edition of Luther's works which appeared in the seventeenth century, the eighteenth century witnessed the publication of two worthy editions of his complete works, the Leipsic edition (1729-1740) and the Walch edition (1750-1753). The Latin works of the Reformer were now for the first time all translated into German. It is clear that

Luther's works were being read, and that, too, with appreciation. Some few of his writings were finding their way into other languages than the German. On both sides of the Channel men began to call upon Luther in support of their positions. The personal influence of the Reformer was coming to life again after its sleep under the cold formalism of the seventeenth century.

John Wesley, the leader among English pietists, relates in his journal that his conversion took place one evening at a meeting of one of those societies which in England corresponded to the German *collegia pietatis* of Spener and Francke. Wesley's conversion, that epochal event which made him the leader of English evangelism, occurred, he himself tells us, "about a quarter before nine" while "one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans." Quite directly, therefore, Luther's religious influence, resurrected from scholasticism and refurnished in the spirit of pietism, led to the great evangelical revival of the eighteenth century in England. In Luther's spiritual struggle men found the mirror of their own inner experience, and that fact, in a day of one-sided subjectivity, served as a strong magnet to draw men to him.

Another appreciative English reader of Luther in this period, kindred in spirit to the pietists especially in the supremely practical aim of his religion, was John Bunyan. He writes thus of Luther's commentary on Galatians: "The God in whose hands are all our days and ways did cast into my hand one day a book of Martin Luther's. It was his comment on Galatians..... When I had but a little way perused, I found my condition in his experience so largely and profoundly handled, as if his book had been written out of my heart..... I do prefer this book of Martin Luther upon the Galatians (except the Holy Bible) before all the books that ever I have seen, as most fit for a wounded conscience."

But of course the pietists of Germany were the ones who felt most keenly their spiritual relationship with Luther. Spener, Francke, Arnold, Bengel, Zinzendorf,—all are loud in their praise of the Reformer and keen in

their appreciation of his religious experiences. They are fond of picturing his terrible spiritual struggle and the severe temptations he endured. They never tire of emphasizing the religious worth of the man. They delight to picture his inner development though of course not in any genetic historical sense. All the insight and power of his Reformation they derive from his personal experience of religion. And herein they hit upon an important truth.

Spener heartily recommended the study of Luther's writings and placed them next to the Bible as means of devotion. Luther's chief merit he found in the rediscovery of the pure Gospel. He tries to characterize Luther with a list of "seven genuine gifts of the Holy Spirit" which were "imparted to the dear man in full measure." These are great learning, fine eloquence, untiring diligence, fervent love for God and man, an exemplary life, and patience that was always rejoicing. Similar sentiments are expressed by Francke with special emphasis upon the restoration of the primitive Gospel. Gottfried Arnold, in one of the chapters of his "Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie," presents a description of Luther's character and an evaluation of his work that may be regarded as unexcelled until the days of Herder.

From their first-hand knowledge of the man through his writings the pietists were able to call him to their service in various ways. In their condemnation of philosophy and worldly wisdom they introduced Luther as their chief witness. In justification of their conventicles they pointed to the passage in the German missal where Luther refers to the intimate circle of "those who are seriously concerned about their Christian life" (die mit Ernst Christen sein wollen). In their depreciation of the stated church services they could quote words from Luther that seem to support their position. At many points they came into conflict with the belated representatives of the age of orthodoxy, and here the pietists always sought to exorcise the weakening spirit of scholasticism by calling upon the true spirit of Martin Luther.

In the sharp controversy between the pietists of Halle and the orthodox of Wittenberg, both sides claimed to be the true followers of Luther, and on this point the controversy was waged. Pastor Seidel came to Spener's aid with his "Lutherus redivivus" in which Luther is set forth in his own words as a vigorous antagonist of congealed orthodoxy. Schwentzel wrote a book to prove that Luther was Spener's predecessor and that Spener was Luther's true successor. While a treatise from the pen of a pastor Jung proceeds to show that Count Zinzendorf is the living and victorious embodiment of Martin Luther.

Thus intimately did the pietists as a class feel themselves related to the spirit and temper of Luther. But there was far less uniformity of conception, far more independence of thought, among the pietists than there had been among their orthodox fathers. The frigid objectivity of neo-scholasticism had melted away before the glowing passion of subjective religion. This perfervid subjectivism it was impossible to retain in uniform moulds. The inner religious experience of the individual had rendered him largely independent of any external human authorities in matters of religion. Consequently Luther was no longer accepted as the supreme and sole authority. In fact the leading representatives of the pietistic movement did not regard it as a sacrilege to point out Luther's limitations, his weaknesses, and even his actual faults. Criticisms of his character and of his work are not wanting among the pietists. These criticisms are important because they indicate the first efforts at a psychological-historical understanding of the Reformer's personality and of his mission.

They strongly opposed the virtual apotheosis which many in the age of orthodoxy had applied to Luther. They emphasized the fact that the Reformer, great as were his merits, nevertheless was only a man and very human at that. They did not try to cover over his weaknesses but frankly admitted and deplored them. They protested against the practice of placing him in a class with the apostles and other Bible heroes. The puritanic and ascetic strain in the pietistic movement manifested itself

in criticism of Luther's cheerful disposition and his enjoyment of the pleasures of life. Professor Herrnschmidt of Halle expresses a longing for a Luther "cleansed of all impurities," and the impurities are found on close inspection to be his sharp temper and his tendency to jest.

Sometimes the criticisms went deeper and laid hold on Luther's work itself. The pietists frequently complained that Luther laid too much emphasis upon doctrine and was too dogmatic and severe in the theological discussions of his day. They also found fault with his translation of the Bible. New work in the languages and a new method of exegesis had brought to light many a weakness in Luther's translation. Some of the pietistic leaders set themselves to work, each in his own way, to improve the translation but nothing noteworthy resulted from their efforts. The free spirit of historical criticism which Luther had exercised with reference to the books of the Bible had completely escaped the notice of the orthodox in the seventeenth century. Its memory was revived by the pietists but in general it was disapproved. Luther was held to be in error in his judgment concerning the book of Revelation and the Epistle of James.

One of the pietists, Konrad Dippel, in his criticism of Luther and his work, went so far as to draw up a complete "register of Luther's sins," and prominent among the shadows of the great man's image he placed his passionate temperament, his coarseness, his dogmatic attitude in matters of doctrine, and his dependence on the worldly government. But all these criticisms are to be understood as indications of the subjective individualism and the religious independence of the age, and taken together with the high words of appreciation that came from this same class of men, they indicate merely an honest effort at a historical understanding of the man and a sincere desire to enter into personal relationship with him.

But how were the pietists to combine in their own thought both their praise and their criticism of Luther? This was long before the historical science had taught

men to distinguish between the permanent content of a movement and its transient form. The most convenient way, therefore, to account for the combination of virtues and faults in Luther's reformatory activity was to distinguish between a younger and an older Luther. This distinction the pietists wrought out with great care. The sharp break between the two Luthers was generally agreed to have taken place during Luther's controversy with Carlstadt. The younger Luther the pietists claimed for themselves while the other Luther they left to the orthodox. They enthused over the young Samson who had triumphed over parsons and Philistines, the young man of invincible courage and of deep spiritual power. But they freely criticised and rejected the middle-aged and the older Luther, the man of dogma, allied with the nobles and princes, the jovial man of song and drink. Not infrequently in the controversy between the pietists and the orthodox, when one of the debaters would cite Luther, it would be demanded: "Which Luther did you mean?" This was characteristic.

It is not too much, therefore, to say that with the pietists the spirit of criticism was awakening in refreshing contrast to the blind enthusiasm and the unreasoning hate of previous generations. A more scholarly interest in the life and deeds of Luther began to be manifested. And the age of pietism first drew the distinction between Lutherism and Lutheranism.

PERIOD OF RATIONALISM.

Close upon the heels of pietism came the age of enlightenment with its rationalists and deists. In England pietism followed rationalism and largely robbed it of its influence upon the future. But in Luther's own land pietism came first and rationalism afterwards, with the consequence that rationalism remained to influence the thought and the theology of Germany far more profoundly and permanently than it influenced that of England. The impulse to German rationalism came from across the Channel and was promoted in Germany particularly by the philosophy of Leibniz and Wolff. It was the spirit of the Renaissance resurrected and now pru-

dentially allied with the spirit of Protestantism. But the German rationalists were not unrelated to the pietists. The two groups fought side by side against the cold formalism of orthodoxy. They both found a congenial home in Halle. They both united in a demand for the publication and distribution of Luther's works and they both preferred the younger Luther. But in their interpretation of Luther's personality and work they sometimes agreed, sometimes greatly diverged.

Strange as it may seem, the rationalists found many things in Luther to approve. They overlooked the fact that he had persistently condemned human reason and had pronounced it the devil's bride. They overlooked his insistence upon a personal experience of sin and of divine grace and they overlooked some of the outstanding characteristics of his forceful personality, in order that they might draw near to him in admiration and esteem.

In contrast with the pietists the illuminists loudly applauded Luther's alliance with the princes and the government. They only deplored the fact that he sometimes launched such severe attacks against certain individuals among the princes. And one of the writers of this period regards it as the one indelible stain on Luther's life that he used such sharp tones in his controversy with Henry VIII. But Luther's generally friendly attitude towards the princes and later his dependence upon them, a fact which has been a ground of offense to so many during these four centuries, the rationalists cordially commended. These men laid great stress upon the privileges of citizenship and the practical duties to the state, and in the religious coloring of Luther's political ideas they found a welcome confirmation of their own emphasis upon political virtues.

Another point in which the rationalists deviated from the judgment of the pietists was concerning the joys and pleasures of life. The rationalists were utter strangers to the ascetic ideals of the pietists and they heartily approved of Luther's joviality and his love of pleasure. They gloried in the refreshing figure of one who had extricated himself from formalism and legalism of every kind,

moral as well as religious. They took delight in quoting his witticisms, in describing his engagement and marriage and family life, and in picturing his recreation hours.

The rationalists were thoroughly at home in the work-a-day world. Theirs was a sort of religious pragmatism. The test of religion they saw in its usefulness. And from Luther's practical piety, which imparted a halo to every common task, they took encouragement in their own efforts at a practical religion.

This feature in the rationalistic appraisement of Luther is very evident from the character of the quotations from his writings that occur most frequently among the rationalists. His letters were preferred, doubtless because of their occasionalistic character. The special selections that were gathered from his works for separate publication indicate the practical turn of the times. Bretschneider published his "Luther's Message to Our Times" and Lindner his "Useful Material from Luther's Writings." And in these collections Luther is made to speak not as a theologian nor as a Reformer, but as a "good teacher, a faithful friend, an affectionate father, a public educator, and a useful citizen." His words were so selected and arranged as to present practical instruction on such varied subjects as the art of studying, the science of Biblical interpretation, directions for preaching, for catechising, for raising children, for good citizenship, thoughts on plagiarism, on the value of domestic industries, on gymnastics, and so forth. Surely there was no lack of regard for Luther's practical turn of mind. But this awkward appreciation of Luther as a practical man of affairs almost completely ignored the heart of Luther's piety which had its origin in the assurance of God's grace and was so thoroughly religious in its orientation that the non-religious factors in civilization were quite secondary and entirely peripheral in his thought.

But the rationalists glorified Luther most of all as the hero of freedom, freedom of conscience, freedom from the thrall of the papacy, freedom from the strangling dogmas, the priestly ceremonies, and the ecclesiastical

power of Catholicism. The Roman Catholic view of the world was diametrically opposed to the fundamental principles of rationalism. The increasing influence of the Jesuits was offensive to these champions of human reason, these enemies of all external authority. They were loud, therefore, in their praise of the sixteenth century hero who had burst the fetters of ecclesiastical bondage and had broken the shackles which bound the consciences of men. This was the strongest strain in their references to Luther, his achievement on behalf of the freedom of conscience.

This may be seen most clearly from the last volume of Walch's edition of Luther's works. Walch himself was a peculiar mixture of orthodox, pietist, and rationalist. In his twenty-fourth volume he presents in great detail a biography and a characterization of Luther, together with a register of his achievements. The climax of Luther's achievements he calls his liberation of the human conscience. And so from the middle of the century Luther is the veritable herald of illuminism. Even Frederick the Great who had regarded the "mad monk" as a "barbarous writer" is ready to style him the Liberator of his country. This thought found a hearty welcome in every rationalist mind. It occupied a prominent place in the tercentennial of 1817, and today it still resounds in various quarters.

But with all their admiration of Luther as a champion of free thought the rationalists asserted their own independence of thought by freely criticising him. They deprecated his severe dealings with those who did not agree with him. In his attitude towards the Swiss theologians they found him guilty of narrow-mindedness and dogmatism. They severely criticized his literary style or lack of style, and regarded his influence upon the German language as deplorable. But many of these things they sought to excuse by pointing to Luther's historical background.

Some of the rationalists expressed a greater admiration for Erasmus than for Luther. And Semler even went so far as to say that neither Luther nor Zwingli nor

Melanchthon had ever discovered or introduced a single new idea, while Erasmus had accomplished more for religion and theology than all the rest of them together. Other criticisms were directed against his catechisms and his translation of the Bible. Like the pietists, only more systematically, the rationalists undertook a new translation. But this also failed. Nevertheless, new catechisms were published, and Luther's hymns were "corrected" and "improved." Thus the criticisms, like the indorsements for the most part touched only the surface and did not reach the real heart and purpose of the man.

The religious value of Luther the rationalists found in his "search for truth" in his "zeal for knowledge." There is not the least effort to comprehend the deep inner struggle which Luther passed through and which alone furnishes a key to the understanding of Luther's development and of his life. His personal struggles in the cloister the rationalists grouped with his sickness. Nowhere among these devotees of reason was there the slightest appreciation of the strategic importance of Luther's doctrine of justification by faith alone. His service to religion, they said, consisted in his courageous opposition to the Papists, his liberal criticism of the Bible, and his redemption of human conscience from bondage to external authority.

Thus the age of rationalism repeats the process of translating Luther into the terms of its own ideals. Nevertheless the work of the rationalists in their estimates of Luther marks an advance in the progressive understanding of the Reformer's personality and work. They came nearer to a psychological analysis of the man and a historical appreciation of his work than any previous age had done. And the advance that is seen most distinctly in their appreciation of the man grows out of the fact that in their effort to claim him for their cause it was necessary for them to go back of his doctrinal system and his individual words and deeds and his separate achievements and merits, back to the real spirit of the man and his fundamental impelling motives. Whether

this was done successfully or not, the effort itself marks progress.

PERIOD OF ROMANTICISM.

Now with the turn from the eighteenth century to the nineteenth we enter upon an entirely new stage in the history of thought. This most recent age is an age of romanticism in literature, of idealism in philosophy, of liberalism in theology, and of historical inquiry in everything. Under the influence of this new age, every aspect of religion has been reconsidered. Christianity has come under a new interpretation. Our understanding of the sixteenth century Reformation has been taken under critical review. And our picture of Luther has been drafted anew. The new picture is not yet completed: the process of reinterpretation is still going on.

The nineteenth century is remarkable for the variety of spiritual streams that run side by side through the century. And yet this very complication of movements, this very diversity of intellectual and cultural environment, has brought us to a completer understanding of the German Reformer than could otherwise have been attained. Hitherto each age with its comparative uniformity of strain and sentiment, as we have seen, has emphasized some one aspect of Luther's personality or some single feature of his work. The Reformer has stood successively in the various colors of the spectrum. It has been the mission of the past century and a quarter to combine the colors and to shed on Luther the full light of day, to overcome the limited vision and one-sidedness of viewpoint and to give us the full Luther standing out in stereoscopic relief. The full history of this interesting but complex process would require a stately volume. We can attempt here only the barest suggestion of a sketch.

The various estimates of Luther that have come to the front since the birth of Kant's critical philosophy may be gathered into three general groups. The first group is characterized by the prevalence of romanticism and ceased to predominate after the overthrow of Napoleon.

The second group is characterized by the prevalence of liberalism or neo-rationalism, and predominated during the middle portion of the last century. The third and most recent period begins roughly with the quadricentennial year of 1883. In this period we are still involved.

The high tide of romanticism claimed many of the contemporaries of Kant, such as Lessing and Klopstock, Herder and Hamann. Lessing was still under the influence of rationalism. But he never idealized Luther as did most of the rationalists. He was frankly conscious of a wide divergence between his own religious views and those of Luther. Nevertheless, Lessing loved Luther for his personality, and he exclaimed: "The evidences of humanity that I find in him are as precious and instructive to me as all his shining perfections." This is characteristic and at the same time significant. The rationalists as a group looked upon life from the point of view of the aesthetic ideal. They set up an entirely new conception of personality. They held that the measure of individual genius is to be found not in a man's moral perfections, nor in his practical usefulness, nor even in his intellectual attainments, but in the originality, symmetry and force of his nature. Such a standard of judgment found excellent material in Martin Luther.

The romanticists, therefore, protested against the rationalistic criticism of Luther's language and literature. Klopstock, in particular, placed the sixteenth century Reformer on a level with Shakespeare as a literary genius and poetically asserted that Luther had "made the language of the Fatherland a language of men and of angels." Hamann, on the other hand, without discerning any great intrinsic worth in Luther's compositions and translations, nevertheless discovered that great and powerful personalities are always inclined to paradoxes and so he delighted in Luther's exaggerations, his contradictions, and his harshnesses.

The height of German poetry was reached in Goethe and Schiller, the poets of classic idealism. But neither of them made any real progress in the interpretation of Luther's historical significance. Goethe, it is true, had

a lively admiration for Luther's work in his victorious struggle with the papal hierarchy, in his translation of the Bible, and in his return to the original teachings of Christ. But in his evaluation of Luther's personality Goethe comes entirely under the spell of romanticism. After defining genius as "creative force" capable of bringing forth deeds that endure, he says of Luther: "He was a genius of a very remarkable kind; he has made his influence felt this many a day and it is impossible to reckon the days or the centuries when his creative force will cease to be felt." Beyond these superficial generalities the great poet had no penetrative insight into Luther's historical function. And Schiller, too, despite his general historical interest, makes no advance upon Goethe in his appreciation of the German Reformer. These poets saw Luther's sole significance in the fact that he was the father of German Protestantism.

The philosophers of the period, Kant and Fichte, made no important advance upon the views of the other writers, so far as the appraisement of Luther is concerned.

But there was one writer in this period who sounded a note that has continued to ring to our own day. Gottfried Herder it was who pointed out that it is not sufficient merely to indulge in general terms of praise for Luther, not sufficient merely to refer to the splendid truths that he uttered or to the mighty deeds that he wrought. If we are to gather anything worth while from Luther's life it is of supreme importance, says Herder, that we understand his position in the connected course of history. We can measure his significance only if we examine his words and deeds in the light of their historical conditions. Luther had actually felt the Word of God not only in the great events of universal history, but also in his own individual experience. No one can really know Luther, therefore, unless he penetrates to the very depths of his soul and approaches his life from within. The important thing in history is not the mere knowledge of the truth, but the inner appropriation of it and the outward application of it. This is the key to the understanding of Luther's character and conduct, and the ap-

plication of this standard to Luther's life and work marks him as a genuine genius, a true hero of history, a decided agent of progress. These ideas of Herder's, hidden for a while even in his own later thought, were destined to exert a powerful influence upon the Luther literature of a later period.

The period of romanticism, we may say, therefore, by its emphasis upon aesthetic personality and by its new conception of genius blazed the way to a deeper understanding of Luther's peculiarities. By preparing the ground for a better development of the entire science of history, by cultivating among the intellectual classes a genuine historical sense and a high regard for the supersensible and the personal in history, it pointed out the road and invited men to travel to a fuller evaluation of Luther's mission in the history of civilization.

PERIOD OF LIBERALISM AND CRITICISM.

After the overthrow of Napoleon the theologians occupy the foreground of our interest in the appraisement of Luther. And here it is not the students of Church History who contributed most to our understanding of Luther, but the representatives of Systematic Theology. Only gradually did the theologians find their way to Luther. Their orientation was for a long time philosophical rather than historical. But slowly the suggestions of the younger Herder were taken up again and wrought into practice, and then the period of the historical perspective had set in. Then at every turn the problems multiplied, step by step the investigation progressed, and our understanding of the Reformer deepened.

The theology of the nineteenth century is largely pervaded by the spirit of Schleiermacher. But so far as Luther is concerned Schleiermacher is not typical of the views of the theologians. He had no consistent or sustained interest in Luther. It is evident that he studied Luther's works but concerning Luther himself his utterances are entirely occasionalistic. For example, when Claus Harms published his ninety-five theses, Schleier-

macher took occasion to contrast them with Luther's and to point out that Luther's theses were without passion or vanity and had sprung from pure zeal and earnest prayer. Otherwise the tercentennial called forth no distinctive utterance from the great theologian. Again, when Frederick William III was trying to force his new *Agende* on the Church and cited Luther in support of the idea, Schleiermacher felt impelled to point out that the genuine spirit of Luther would revolt against such a procedure. Beyond this there is very little from Schleiermacher about Luther. No, the father of nineteenth century theology did not seek a historical foundation for his type of piety or his theological system.

After Schleiermacher came a group of speculative theologians. They took their cue primarily from Hegel. This when applied to history brought them to ideas similar to those of Herder. They took up the rich heritage that was left by Herder and the romanticists and greatly enriched it before they passed it on. Typical of this class is Ferdinand Christian Baur. Theologically Baur was not at all related to Luther. But he realized that in every great movement there must be an individual factor as well as general factors, a forceful personal spirit as well as favorable general conditions. And in Luther's soul he saw the source of the new religious life that was begotten by the Reformation. Then, too, Baur had a new appreciation of Luther's own inner development. He realized that Luther had become a Reformer in the course of his long struggle for the inner assurance of the forgiveness of his sins. Baur, therefore, distinguishes carefully between the earlier and the later Luther, and he accounts for that difference by pointing to his inner development under the influence of the times and of his individuality. This was a decided step forward.

Influences from both Schleiermacher and Baur united to produce a class of theologians known as the liberalists *par excellence*. Their views were strongly tinged with rationalism, only under the growing influence of historical criticism they were robbed of the spirit of assurance and dogmatism with which the older rationalists had as-

serted their attitude. The neo-rationalists laid emphasis upon the practical virtues of Luther and made special application of them to their own advanced political views. At the same time, however, they asserted their independence of Luther in matters of religion and contrasted their own pure Protestantism with the mediaeval elements that remained in Luther's system.

A good illustration of the views of the liberalists may be found in Heinrich Lang. In his characterization of Luther he applied the most intensive criticism that the subject had ever received. He sought out the Roman Catholic sources of Luther's Christianity and tried to show in each case their historical or psychological derivation. Luther's emphasis upon the Bible and his experience of justification by faith Lang regards as due to the essential limitations of his nature imposed by his historical antecedents. It was the tragedy of Luther's life that he sought to overthrow mediaeval Catholicism and yet himself remained embedded in it. For his entire religious disposition and his fundamental ideas belong to Catholicism, and the only Protestant element about him is his struggle with the hierarchy on behalf of religious liberty and freedom of theological inquiry. The essence of the Protestant is to be found rather in Zwingli, Carlstadt, the leaders of the Anabaptists, and the rebellious peasants. All these ideas of Lang's became very important a little later.

Parallel with these liberalists ran a very different group. This was a group of new Lutherans who looked up to Luther again as a Church Father. They were the confessionally orthodox. The group includes such men as Stahl, Vilmar, Philippi, Löhe, Kliefoth, and Kahnus. Their advance upon the old orthodoxy of the seventeenth century lay in the fact that they broke with the old view that Luther's greatest merit was the restoration of pure doctrine. They had some appreciation of the forward look in Luther's movement. In that connection Vilmar says: "Luther's experience of sin and divine grace introduced into the history of Christian piety an entirely new experience and one that had never been known be-

fore." This serves to indicate how the older movements, when repriminated from time to time, show the effects of the general progress that has taken place since their last appearance.

Between these two groups, the liberalists and the neo-orthodox, was the so-called mediating school. The theologians of this school laid emphasis on the simplicity of Luther's biblical faith and the purity of his religion. This group included several merited biographers of Luther, such as Koestlin and Kawerau.

Mention at least must be made of the Erlangen school, fathered by Conrad von Hofmann, and numbering such men as Franz Delitzsch, Theodosius Harnack, and Theodore Kolde. Here the chief effort is to interpret the inner religious consciousness of the Reformer rather than his theological system. From this school came the "modern positive" theology under the leadership of Seeberg. The modern positive theologians have been zealous apologists for Luther against Roman Catholic attacks but they have worked along the same general lines as the Erlangen school and have made no distinctive contribution to our understanding of Luther.

Quite new and significant for our study is the attitude of the founder of Ritschianism. With Albrecht Ritschl for the first time in the nineteenth century the figure of Martin Luther occupies a really prominent position in the intensive thought of the theologians. In Ritschianism the apathy of Schleiermacher is overcome. Ritschl's theology was orientated in Luther and based on the consciousness that in Christ we experience a gracious God. Ritschl himself was consciously Lutheran, not in a confessional sense but in a religious sense, and he strove to deepen the Lutheran consciousness of the Church. His students testify that his lectures breathed the very spirit of the Reformation and actually impelled them to a study of Luther and the Lutheran confessions. The results are seen in the Ritschian school. The systematic theologian of the school, William Herrmann, indicates his attitude by the very title of his chief work: "Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott im Anschluss an Luther darges-

tellt." It is this school also that has given us such appreciative students of Luther as Brieger, Loofs, Karl Müller, and Adolf Harnack.

Under the influence of Ritschl and his followers, therefore, the long theological movement which began with Schleiermacher was turned away from occasionalistic partiality and epigonus externality to an intensive and determining scholarly interest in the whole Luther, kernel and husk. Never before since the days of the Reformation itself have the dogmaticians interested themselves so keenly in historical studies. Never before in the history of Protestantism have the problems concerning Luther and the Reformation engaged so many scholarly hands or received so much scholarly energy and insight as in this generation of Ritschlians. Never before has there been attained such a diversity of view on details and such a uniformity of conception on the main points as that which our own day possesses in its heritage from the nineteenth century. But that brings us to the present situation.

THE PRESENT.

In 1883, at the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth, the inspiration and the utensils were at hand for unusual achievements in Luther research. The utensils were prepared by Ranke's school in Germany and its offspring, the Oxford school in England, whose leaders were Stubbs and Creighton. These critical methods were now being applied also in the field of Church History.

The inspiration to this new era in Luther research came from several sources. It came partly from the general historical interest of all theologians at that time, partly from the quadricentennial itself, and partly from the publication in 1877 of the first volume of the Catholic Janssen's work, "Die Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters," which in 1883 appeared in its eighth edition. The result was that in a very short time there arose a numerous group of vigorous scholars who began with critical hand to lay hold on the problem that had been raised, to satisfy the interests

that had been aroused, and to arrive at an undistorted and truthful picture of the Reformer and the Reformation. This group includes such men as Knaake, Enders, Kolde, Kawerau, Brieger, Tschackert, Buchwald, and Walther. If any additional inspiration had been needed so far as the Catholic polemic is concerned it would have been furnished by the more recent works of Denifle and Grisar.

The material results of the investigations in this latest period have been much larger than that of all other periods combined. The Weimar edition of Luther's works, numbering now sixty-five large volumes, stands upon the very pinnacle of achievement in intensive Luther research and embodies the results of scholarly investigations that extend far beyond the boundaries of Germany. There is not a phase of Luther's life, nor an aspect of his theology, nor a department of his literary activity, that has not been made the object of special research and the subject of a separate monograph in the Luther literature of the past thirty-five years. Luther's relation to his contemporaries and the relation of his movement to other movements in the sixteenth century has occupied a special body of literature and has called forth fruitful controversy.

In general it may be said that this last period of research is bringing us nearer and nearer to a definite, concrete and complete picture of Martin Luther, his personality and his work. And through it all nothing is clearer than the many-sidedness of the Reformer and the complicated character of his Reformation in its significance for the modern world. This is why there are so many different views today concerning Luther and the Reformation, even among those who are acquainted with the facts. Each man according to his point of view, each group according to its particular persuasion, selects for emphasis some one characteristic or group of characteristics in the man, some one stage or period in his development, some one feature or group of features in his movement. Even most of the differences among those who bear his name today in this country and in Europe

can be understood on this ground. There is a real need today for a composite photograph of all true views so that we may see the whole Luther.

A Lutheran minister, the Rev. W. N. Harley, of Columbus, Ohio, has recently published a very readable book called "Little Journeys with Martin Luther," in which by means of a fascinating story he shows from the very words of Luther himself that Luther could not be admitted today to any of the large general bodies of Lutherans in America. With equal ease and grace it could be shown from Luther's words that he could be admitted to every one of those bodies, such was the versatility of the man, so many were the phases and stages of his work.

The varying judgments upon Luther that are to be found in the Protestant literature of our own day are to be explained in part, therefore, by the varying emphasis that is placed upon the different stages of his development. And no other aspect of the general subject has received so much attention in recent years as the history of Luther's inner development. Some idea of the significance of this fact may be gathered from the latest German biography of Luther. This is by Otto Scheel of Tübingen. The first volume of Scheel's Luther appeared this year. The whole work bears the sub-title, "From Catholicism to the Reformation," and the first volume traces Luther's development to July 17, 1505, his entrance into the cloister at Erfurt. In Koestlin's life of Luther, which has had the widest sale and study of all biographies since 1883, these first twenty-two years in Luther's life cover only forty-five pages; in Scheel's work they cover three hundred and one pages. Scheel's purpose in his thorough-going scientific work is to describe only Luther's development from a Roman Catholic to a full-fledged Reformer. It is not evident as yet at what point Scheel regards that development as completed. But it is very evident that the interest and the emphasis centers upon the younger Luther and particularly his inner evolution.

This suggests another question, one that is in the very forefront of scholarly interest just now. Which was the real Luther? The distinction between the two Luthers

is an old one, as we have seen. Different ages have varied in their choices between the two. In general the liberal theologians and philosophers of the last period have preferred the younger Luther as the real Luther. Much attention has been attracted, therefore, by the remarkable position of the brilliant Ernst Troeltsch on this question. In his striking essay, itself a volume, on "Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit," which appears in "Die Kultur der Gegenwart" (Teil I, Abteilung IV, I. Hälfte, Ss. 253-458), as well as in other of his works, he sets forth with sharp acumen the view that the older Luther is the real Luther and that both Luther and his Reformation are thorough-going products of Catholicism and mediaevalism with scarcely any real significance for the modern world. Troeltsch places Erasmus and even Melanchthon above Luther, and the really significant elements of the sixteenth century he sees in the Anabaptists and the radical movements. The modern period of history, according to Troeltsch, begins in the eighteenth century. This view is really a scholarly scientific version of Lang's view of half a century earlier. It has caused quite a stir among scholars. Some English and American scholars have already accepted the view as settled and assured. But in Germany many critical voices have been raised, first of all that of Loofs in his "Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit," and now the historical research has taken a new turn. The result will doubtless be a much clearer picture of the Humanists, the Counter-Reformation, and the radical movements of the sixteenth century.

Our sketch of Luther's career through these four centuries has indicated a line of movement that despite occasional retrogressions and reactions has been generally forward in its direction. First unreflective personal popularity, then an uninformed admiration for his individual words and deeds, then a pietistic or else a rationalistic conception of his fundamental motive coupled with mild criticism of certain features of his life and thought, then an effort to understand his personality by means of psychology, and finally in the nineteenth century an

application of all the improved instruments of science to every aspect of the man's personality and activity and influence. In the various nuances of Protestant Christianity today we still have some representatives of every one of the periods that have passed before our review of the four centuries. This is good for it and will help us to find and to keep the whole Luther. The newest problem concerns itself with Luther's relation and that of his Reformation to the origin of the modern world. It will be interesting to note just what turn the Quadricentennial Celebration of this year will give to the appraisement of Luther.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE III.

MELANCHTHON AND THE LORD'S SUPPER
AFTER HIS DIVERGENCE FROM LUTHER.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, D.D.

Up to 1530 Melanchthon shared Luther's views entirely. Though at the Marburg Colloquy in 1529 he with Luther denied fellowship with the Zwinglians, yet that Colloquy made an impression on him he never got over. He was convinced that they were orthodox in everything else. He had found them milder than he had expected, and friendly. The more he thought the matter over the more sad he became because they had been rejected so peremptorily. While still not in favor of any union with them, that was on account of political fear lest the German princes would make themselves obnoxious to the emperor. For the latter hated the Swiss both on account of their love of freedom and of the radical and democratic tendencies of their Reformation.

But in the same year 1530 a book fell into the hands of Melanchthon which did not leave him untouched. It was a dialogue by Ecolampadius, the great Reformer of Basel, on the Supper in which he showed that the views of the Fathers need testing much more than Melanchthon had tested them. He showed that different views were in the ancient Church, which generally divided into two tendencies, the mystic and the symbolic. According to the mystic view there was a secret union of Christ or of the Logos with the bread and wine, but there was no defined doctrine as to this union. They only emphasized the practical element, the blessing of partaking. The doctrine of a change in the elements came out first since the 4th century. The symbolic view was that the elements were signs or figures, and this view was also in the Church Fathers. When Melanchthon read this book by Ecolampadius he wrote to Luther "Ecolampadius has written a dialogue against me, and as it seems to me more

carefully than he is usually accustomed to write. I shall bring it with me when God gets me out of here."¹ He wrote several things during the Reichstag of 1530 to make clear why he could not go with Zwingli, nor enter into Butzer's union proposals. He would not allow with Zwingli that Christ's body after the ascension was in a certain definite place, nor with Butzer that Christ was present in the Lord's Supper only to believers, saying on the other hand that although he was not specially in the bread he was really there.

In the beginning of 1531 Luther and Melanchthon heard of an important concession from the Reformed. Toward the end of 1530 Butzer by the Strassburg magistracy sent to the landgrave Philip of Hesse and to Duke Ernst of Lüneberg, both of whom were intensely interested in union between Luther and the Reformed, a compromise to the effect that Zwingli and Oecolampadius agreed with Luther that Christ's true body and true blood were in the Supper, and were reached and offered with the Word to the soul for food and for strengthening of faith. The landgrave communicated this to the Elector of Saxony and he to Luther. Luther heard this gladly, and said if he had their own assurances there might be a chance for union. At the same time Luther wrote to Butzer that he could scarcely believe that the Swiss would be ready to go so far. But there could be no union until they taught that the body of Christ was also received by the godless. Now neither in the Augsburg Confession nor in the Apology for that Confession, both drawn up by Melanchthon, was there any mention of the Real Presence to the godless. Butzer therefore could easily think that Luther and Melanchthon did not intend to insist on that aspect of the doctrine. And in fact they did give in so far as to write at the request of the Elector concerning the new proposal of Butzer. They said that if Butzer would really confess that Christ's body is truly with the signs, they would be satisfied and would suspend for the present a discussion over the partaking by the godless.² This

¹ Corp. Ref. 2, 217 (July 20, 1530).

² De Wette, Luther's Briefe 4, 325 (March 1531).

was a most important concession on Luther's side, as at the Marburg Colloquy this was a point of life and death with him. Was Melanchthon back of this concession? On January 22, 1531, Melanchthon wrote to Butzer. "I rejoice exceedingly that you acknowledge the presence of Christ as to his soul, and I cannot see why you should deny his presence as to the signs. Try to come to an understanding. If Luther were sure that he knew Zwingli's and Ecolampadius' view fully, that they really taught what you write,"³ etc. But alas! Melanchthon's hopes for peace were in vain. Butzer had promised too much for the Swiss. But Melanchthon still kept up his correspondence with Butzer. In a letter of April 1531 he prays for union and says that this passionate strife between Luther and Butzer never pleased him, and he hopes it will cease.⁴ Schmidt quotes a MS. letter of Melanchthon to Thomas Blaurer, in which he says that the idea of a bodily presence of Christ everywhere is more and more suspicious to him. He thinks, as Luther teaches, that Christ is in the bread as he is everywhere, that it is difficult to conceive that as bodily, as Christ is everywhere only according to his Godhead. He would not utter such thoughts against Luther, but proposed that Blaurer do so.⁵ And he did, but whether Luther answered is not known. If this letter is genuine, and of this Schmidt has apparently no doubt, it shows a remarkable coming down from the Luther view.

In his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Melanchthon says that "in the Supper Christ offers to us his body and blood to witness to us that he has gone hence for us, so that we can have forgiveness of sins through him." But of the way he is present he says nothing. In the Latin edition of the Augsburg Confession (1531) he omitted the words "under form of bread and wine." This does not mean he shared Zwingli's view of a remembrance

3 Cor. Ref. 2. 470.

4 Cor. Ref. 2. 498.

5 Schmidt, Melanchthon, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 315. In spite of the admirable smaller Lives by Richard, New York, 1898, and Ellinger, Berlin 1902, this massive and thorough study by the Strassburg Professor remains indispensable to all students of the Preceptor of Germany.

Supper, which he constantly rejected (1) as too much opposed to literal words of institution, (2) as giving too much play to the reason, and (3) as exciting doubt instead of certainty. "Why circulate profane speculations," he writes to Rothmann, preacher at Münster, "whether Christ is nowhere except in heaven, and sits at definite place. The Scripture orders us to call upon him. We must confess that he is truly with the Word and sign, and that he has promised to be with us and to console us. I know well that acute spirits brood over this, and that learned people indorse Zwingli's doctrine, for which they have apparent grounds. But that is not everything. The Presence, as I state it, has for it the analogy of faith."⁶

It is clear to me that Melanchthon was getting nearer the Reformed doctrine of the Supper, without leaving the substance of the Lutheran. He believed in the Real Presence of the body and blood in the Supper, but only in a heavenly and divine manner, and he was most anxious for a union with the South. When Butzer sent him his book on the preparation for a Council he wrote him:

I shall write you later about your book. I only wish now to say how truly and heartily I love you. You are trying with right diligence what is necessary for a union of the Churches, and I promise to stand by you on this with my best powers. For I am not at all pleased that there should be a split over one doctrine. I do hope that means will be found to make an end of the division. That sudden coming together (at Marburg Colloquy) of men who are determined not to give in can not help out so great an evil. Would to God that you and I at least could have a conference on this doctrine.⁷ (This very thing soon happened).

That is the word of a man who sees no irreconcilable difficulty in the Supper doctrine of himself and the Reformed.

What Melanchthon wanted was the definite assurance that as a pledge of his love and redemption the body and

6 Dec. 24, 1532, in Cor. Ref. 2, 620.

7 Oct. 10, 1533. Corp. Ref. 2, 675.

blood of Christ in which that redemption was won were really present in the Eucharist and given to believers. So far he agreed with Luther and with all High Catholic Churchmen. The essential Presence was fundamental with Melanchthon.⁸ But it was a presence mediated by Christ's Divinity, and so spiritual and divine, not bodily in the sense of Luther. Melanchthon was seeking a *Via Media* between Luther's realism and Butzer's spiritualism, which would preserve the truth of both views, and be a bond of union to both parties. Luther on the other hand would have no middle way. The Swiss, Luther says, see in the Supper only a sign, while "the sum of our opinion is that in and with the bread the body of Christ works and suffers, that he is distributed, eaten and bitten with the teeth. From this opinion I cannot deviate even if the world should tumble around me."⁹

Melanchthon and Butzer did come together with the landgrave of Hesse at Cassel December 1534. There Luther's formula about the true body being bitten with the teeth was placed before Butzer. The latter replied he could not at all agree to that. There was nothing about that in the Augsburg Confession, and it was only in accordance with that Confession which he and his friends could teach. Luther's putting was only a private opinion. Butzer assured Melanchthon that he and the preachers of the upper Rhine country confessed that the body of Christ is essentially and truly received, that bread and wine are signs with which at the same time body and blood are given and partaken, that bread and body are not connected with each other by a mixing of their nature, but by a sacramental union. This notable confession was brought back to Luther, and even Luther said that for the sake of peace he might be reconciled with it for the time being, only there was no hurry. Then Melanchthon and Luther sent it to the other Lutheran theologians to get their views, and Melanchthon wrote them at the same time whether for peace's sake that view could not be tolerated, as in essence it is not different

8 See letter in Latin in *ib.* 2, 800, in German in Schmidt, 318-9.

9 De Wette 4, 569. Dec. 16, 1534.

from ours. At the bottom the only question is about physical union of bread and body. But why do we want that? One can treat the sacrament rightly without touching that.¹⁰ Most of the theologians answered in a friendly way.

There were two things which dominated Melanchthon at this time (1535 ff). First, adherence to the general teaching of the Church Catholic. "I will not be a starter or defender of any new dogma," he wrote to Brentz.¹¹ He was devoted to the truth, and in his mind the truth lay in the general consensus of the Church, not in any extreme doctrine on one side or the other, not in the too literal application of Luther nor in the too figurative of Zwingli. Second, striving after unity of action, view, aim with all Christians,—Reformed on the one hand, liberal Catholic on the other. He made another study of the Fathers, and this brought him to the conclusion that he had been mistaken somewhat as to their view. "I see," he wrote to Brentz, "that there are many expressions of the old writers which clearly explain the sacrament typically or tropically. The contrary passages are either new or opinions. Investigate the matter yourself to see whether you defend the doctrine of the ancients. I heartily wish the Church might decide the matter without sophistry or tyranny." From now on, says Schmidt, he held the view that the spiritual communication of Christ and inner communion with him was the alone essential thing in the Supper, and that outside of the moment of the use of the elements the name sacrament was not deserved.¹²

I have said before (Melanchthon writes in the 1535 edition of *Loci*) that the word sacrament means an external sign which God has joined to his promise, through which he offers grace. So this external sign (bread) is a sacrament, for one should understand and take it for an external divine pledge and seal of the whole Gospel... And so this external sign is to

¹⁰ Cor. Ref. 2. 826f.

¹¹ Ib. 2. 824.

¹² Schmidt, 321.

be received, when we believe the divine promise that we are offered through Christ consolation and the forgiveness of sins. And that external sign God places before our bodily eyes, and lets us here eat, drink and partake, so that we may be awakened in faith and become the more certain and strong in the knowledge of Christ. For when Christ gives us his body, he takes us as members of himself, and shows very comfortably that grace and treasure are for us. For how could God come nearer to us with grace and blessing than when Christ gives us his body and we become his members?.... But when we enjoy all this in the Lord's Supper, the faith in the divine promise must be there, and thus receive through the external signs and the Word consolation and quickening..... There is passionate division and strife over this sacrament. Some dispute whether the word of Christ, This is my body, is a metaphor. How the old teachers understood the word one can see out of their writings. Paul says that the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ, the cup which we drink is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? Therefore when one offers in the Supper bread and wine, there is truly offered to us the body and blood of Christ, and Christ is truly there, and is powerful in us, as Hilarius says: This eating and drinking makes it that Christ is in us and we in him. And it is truly a wonderfully dear great pledge of the highest divine love toward us and the highest mercy, that the Lord in the Supper shows that he truly gives himself to us, that he truly gives us to enjoy his body and blood, that he makes us members of himself, upon which we know that he loves us, takes us up, protects and upholds us.

Now this is a beautiful statement of a high doctrine of the sacrament as a precious spiritual possession, through which in the partaking of the signs, by faith we receive the body and blood, and thus by this challenge to our faith in partaking are built up in Christ. The Reformed

could assent to this, as well as the Lutheran. Even a Methodist—at least a High one—could say Amen to it all. Nothing is said as to how the body is related to the bread, but the spiritual blessing is strongly emphasized. In a letter to his friend Veit Deitrich at Nürnberg he says:

In order not to separate myself too far from the ancients, I set the sacramental Presence in the use [not simply in the signs], and say that with the offered bread and wine Christ is truly present and effective. That is certainly enough. I add nothing as to an inclusion or union, according to which the body attaches to the bread or is mixed with it. What more do you want? One must be content with this, unless you want to assert that body and blood are given separately: this is new, and would not even please the Papists. The physical union raises many questions. Are the parts separate? Are they in bread and wine outside of use? One reads nothing of this in ancients. I will not bring in these disputationes in the Church. Therefore I have spoken little of them in the *Loci* so as to turn aside the youth from these questions.¹³

In order to bring a closer union between the Reformed and Lutheran, a friendly conference was arranged at Wittenberg, where Butzer and Capito (one of the preachers in Strassburg) talked over matters with Luther and Melanchthon, though there were others present. Luther was not well at this time, and the discussion took place in his house, May 1536. Melanchthon drew up a formula for both parties, and both signed it,—the so-called Wittenberg Concord.

1. We confess according to the words of Irenaeus that the Supper consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly. Therefore they (Butzer and his friends) believe and teach that with bread and wine Christ's body and blood are truly and essentially present, given and partaken of. 2. Though they hold that neither transubstantiation, nor local inclusion in the bread, nor any permanent union outside

13 Corp. Ref. 3. 514 April 23, 1538.

of use, takes place, yet they concede that by virtue of sacramental union the bread is the body of Christ; that means, they believe that with the reached bread the body of Christ is at the same time present and truly given. Outside of use, as when the bread is in the monstrance, or carried around in procession, as Papists do, they do not believe that Christ's body is present. 3. They believe that the sacrament in the Church is powerful, and independent of the worthiness of the priest or of those partaking. So as Paul says that even the unworthy partake of the body of Christ,¹⁴ so they [Butzer, etc.] believe that there is given truly the same body and blood, and that they receive them, as where the words and sense are to be preserved. The unworthy partake, however, to judgment, as they misuse the sacrament, because they take it without penitence and faith. It is therefore instituted that those who are penitent and console themselves in Christ through faith, are partakers of the beneficence of Christ and as his members are cleansed by his blood.¹⁵

Written under the immediate eye of Luther this strong statement is rather notable for what it does not say, and it is evident that Luther tried to be moderate and yielding to the best of his ability. A High Church sacramental Methodist or Presbyterian could confess his faith in those words, though a Low Churchman would want to make some distinctions. But if there is only a sacramental union, one may interpret that union to suit the truth as he conceives it. Melanchthon did not hold it was a union of substance, much less of physical interpenetration. Was it then a union of reference, of type, of religious value, or what? The body of Jesus went with it, so to speak. But what is the body of Jesus? And since it can

¹⁴ What Paul says is that "whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat." You will notice that Paul does not say that the unworthy partake of the body, but that the believer partakes of the bread and by faith discerns the body. The unbeliever does not discriminate the body. See 1 Cor. 11:27, 28.

¹⁵ Cor. Ref. 3:75.

be received for salvation only by faith, is it anything else than the blessings which Jesus procured for us in and through that body?

Anyhow the fire-eating Lutherans did not like the Wittenberg Concord, partly because the Reformed signed it. Their not liking it filled Melanchthon with pain. He saw that union with the Roman Catholics was impossible, and felt all the more anxious to bring all who believed the Gospel together. And in this Luther met him with a willingness more than we could expect. So it grieved Melanchthon that some Lutherans spoke of the Churches of the Upper Rhine almost as they did of the Turks. He kept up his studies of the Fathers on the Supper and other matters. "Since for more than 10 years no day and no night has gone by without my thinking over the Supper" (3, 537). This study in Church History convinced him even more strongly that many of the Fathers had a symbolic interpretation of the Words of Institution. He held himself to such passages as 1 Cor. 10, 16, Eph. 5, 30, which seemed to protect the secret of the sacrament against every exaggerated or rationalistic view. The spiritual effect of Christ in the sacrament, the sacramental union, the presence of body and blood *with* bread and wine, the synecdoche, he held as sufficient to preserve the honor and deep sense of the Supper. Therefore in the 1540 edition of the Augsburg Confession he omitted the words, "The contrary doctrine is rejected," and instead of saying, "The body and blood are distributed," he said, "The body and blood are set forth." It has been claimed by my late learned and lamented friend, Professor Dr. James W. Richard, that this meant no change of view of Melanchthon, nor any deviation from Luther. It meant no change of view since 1535, but it certainly meant a change since 1520, and Luther's disposition to put no sprag in the wheel of Melanchthon's irenic advances is much to his credit. The new expressions of Melanchthon presuppose faith in those receiving and were consistent with spiritual reception, while not denying Luther's realistic view. Schmidt says (p. 423-4) that without doubt he made these changes to meet Calvin, with

whom he had talked in Frankfurt in 1539 on the Supper, and in such a way that led Calvin to say that they agreed.

Another evidence of the change in Melanchthon is his new attitude toward the elevation of the host. As a protest against what he thought Carlstadt's depreciation of the Supper, Luther kept up the elevation. Later he kept it up on account of the weak, though holding it not essential, only one of the adiaphora. At the Wittenberg Concord in 1536 Butzer had called Luther's attention to this practice as one done away in Hesse and other German Churches. A strife broke out in Nürnberg over the practice, where one of the preachers wanted it stopped. Dietrich and Osiander wrote to Melanchthon about it, and Melanchthon consulted Luther. The latter burst out, Such things are unimportant. Why should they quarrel about them? But, said Melanchthon, not so. If you believe in the real presence of the body, you must have the elevation, if not, if there is no local presence of the body in the bread, then you ought to omit the elevation. Dietrich had a high view of the Presence, and Melanchthon wrote to him.

The sacraments are signs that with the given things something else is present. Adoration is not necessary, or if you keep it up it should not be made to the bread. Hypostatic union is not the word. Even Catholics don't use that. There is a real union, as that between fire and iron. I believe in a real union, but no inclusive one, but a sacramental, which means that with the given signs Christ is truly effective.¹⁶

Later Melanchthon prevailed upon Luther to give up the elevation, another sign of Luther's reasonableness, and from this time (1543) it disappeared from Protestant worship.

If Luther showed these welcome signs of moderation, he nevertheless soon came out with a fierce book against the Zwinglians. A book or tract had appeared in Köln, the *Kölner Reformation*, said to be by Butzer and Me-

lanchthon, of a quite spiritual tenor with regard to the Supper. The archbishop of Köln handed it to the elector of Saxony Johann Friedrich, who did not like it, and who sent it to Amsdorf, bishop of Naumburg, for his judgment. Amsdorf sent the book to Wittenberg with a very unfavorable judgment. This strengthened Luther against the book, and he sent it to Brück, chancellor to the Elector of Saxony, with a letter in which he said that Amsdorf's article pleased him well. He (Luther) then read the book itself and there was nothing in what it said on sacrament that pleased him. There is much talk, said Luther, about the usefulness, fruit, and honor of the sacrament, but as to the substance it mumbles, and one does not know how to take it, just like the fanatics (apparently here Zwinglians), against whom it does not say a word. You cannot tell from it whether one receives with the mouth the true body and blood of Jesus or not, nor anything against the fanatics (Zwinglians) who have worse articles than the Anabaptists. The book is not only tolerable to the fanatics, but even comforting, rather for their doctrine than for ours. I am very much displeased. And the book is so long-winded that I trace well the prattler Bucer.¹⁷

In private conversations and in lectures and sermons Luther spoke out his dissatisfaction on the new turn things had taken with regard to the Supper, prepared a new book, and looked through his old books to see about the translation of one or more of them into Latin for circulation in France and Italy. All this put poor Melanchthon into an agony of fear. "If this new strife breaks out," said he "it will cause much worse and more tragic confusion than anything hitherto. I am sorry that this tragedy should begin again, more for the sake of public matters than for my own. I don't know what will happen to me. Perhaps I shall have to wander forth in this my (old) age. Is there anything more sorrowful, more deserving of tears than that this holy pledge of love should be used as a subject of strife and division."¹⁸ They

¹⁷ De Wette, 5. 708-9.

¹⁸ Cor. Ref. 5. 461, 464. Aug. 11, 12, 1544.

told Melanchthon that Luther had a book ready in which he was to attack him and Butzer, and was going to set out a formula which they must either subscribe or not be tolerated. "Luther has never driven this matter with more mighty zeal," said Melanchthon. "I give up all hope to see peace kept up between our Churches. Our opponents lift up their heads, and we tear ourselves. This makes me unending pain. As for myself I am quiet, and if he (Luther) presses me too much I shall gladly flee out of this prison."¹⁹ Melanchthon's brother George urged him not to get into a controversy with Luther, but to leave Wittenberg.

But things were not quite so bad. Their fears were more or less groundless. Köstlin says it was not Luther's way to come out suddenly and unexpectedly against friends. However excited and angry he might have been at that time, if he intended to attack Melanchthon publicly, he would not have done it without previously opening his heart to him.²⁰ Luther indeed came out with his book *Kurzes Bekenntniss vom heiligen Sacrament, wider die Schwärmer*, end of September 1544, but it did not mention Melanchthon nor even Butzer. Luther was near the end of his life (d. Feb. 1546). He was ill, irritable and passionate, and he so wrote.

"Before I go to my grave, I want to bring with me this witness and this fame before the judgment seat of my Lord that I with all earnestness have condemned and avoided according to his command in Tit. 3:10 the fanatics and enemies of the sacrament, Carlstadt, Zwingli, Ecolampadius, Stenkefeld (Schwenkfeld), and their disciples in Zurich and wherever they are." He will make firm against the fanatics that in Rom. 4:21 what God speaks he can perform. He asks how one can believe in the humanity and divinity of Christ in one person or of the incarnation of the Saviour, and yet not believe in the article of the Supper. For it is either you believe or you don't believe. Since the fanatics carry on a

¹⁹ To Butzer: ib. 5. 474.

²⁰ Martin Luther, 5 Aufl. v. Kawerau II. 583.

great twaddle about spiritual eating and drinking, and of the unity of Christians at the Supper,— this is only idle figleaves with which they would cover their sins. Since they have blamed the orthodox as 'flesh eaters' and thrown out blasphemies concerning a 'bread God,' I know the right name for them, namely, that they are soul-murderers and have an indeviled, throughdeviled, overdeviled, blasphemous heart and lying mouth. Let no one pray for those who sin unto death (1 Jno. 5:16). I will except the poor people and the weak, who allow themselves to be instructed. I speak of the masters. They are high and often warned. He who does not want to remain, let him go. Though at Marburg I agreed with several doctrines of Zwingli, yet in his posthumous book *Auseinandersetzung des Glaubens* Zwingli allows to be saved Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Numa, etc. Therefore he treated (at Marburg) everything with a false heart, and has become himself a heathen. I will not refute my opponents again in this book."²¹

Kolde says that in spite of its sharpness this *Bekenntniss* was relatively mild, and even more than in earlier writings he shows that what led him to such determined judgment of his opponents was not pleasure in scholastic hair-splitting, nor even a theological, but almost entirely a religious, interest.²² It is only fair to Luther to add that he kept quiet as to any suspicions against Butzer and Melanchthon, especially the latter, and wanted to keep silence, unless they themselves gave strong and open signs of it. He kept from all questions and inquiries which would in any way bring out ill-feeling between himself and Melanchthon. Cruciger wrote to Dietrich Oct. 5, 1544, that although at the beginning they took it for granted that Luther had suspicion or ill-feeling against Butzer and Melanchthon, they had since noticed nothing of the kind. A month later Brück wrote to the elector: "I notice of Philip nothing else than that he and

²¹ Erl. Ausg. 32. 39ff.

²² Kolde, *Martin Luther*. ii. 545 (Gotha 1893).

Martin are quite good friends. The Almighty send his grace." At his next birthday, Nov. 10, 1544, Luther invited to dinner Melanchthon, Cruciger, Bugenhagen, Jonas and Major, where they talked together in love over the Church and the dangers of the present.²³

It seems that Melanchthon had one more conversation with Luther on the Lord's Supper, in which he assured him that he still taught the synechdoche, that he believed that Christ was truly present with the bread and wine and made us his members, and that he hoped Luther would be satisfied with this. After that the subject was avoided.

Melanchthon hoped that no answer would be written to Luther's book, but the Zürichers wrote a sharp reply to it by the pen of Bullinger. Even Calvin did not like the way Bullinger handled Luther.

"I wish you would keep in memory what kind of a man Luther is, the high gifts he possesses, with what bravery and perseverance, with what power and skill of doctrine he has hitherto fought the kingdom of Antichrist and propagated the Gospel of salvation. Even if he should call me a devil, still I would always show him honor, hold him for an elect servant of God, who has, of course, beside glorious virtues his weaknesses. Think that you have to do with a disciple of Christ whom we all have to thank."²⁴

Calvin did not care much for Bullinger's book, which he thought weak. He wrote to Melanchthon: "We are all indebted to greatest thanks to Luther. It pleases me that he has the highest honor, if he would only be more moderate. Good God! What joy we give the papists, and what a sorry example we are leaving to posterity!"²⁵ This was Melanchthon's feeling also in what Schmidt calls this most unhappy of all controversies.

You all know the passion and moral weakness in one matter of the landgrave Philip of Hesse, but on this threatened split between Melanchthon and Luther, the

23 Köstlin, ib. ii. 583-4.

24 Nov. 25, 1544. Quoted by Schmidt, p. 430.

25 June 28, 1545. Quoted by ib., p. 430.

news of which spread through Germany causing fearful consternation among Protestants, he wrote more sensible words, and showed more concern for the Reformation, than many better men. He wrote to Chancellor Brück:

For the honor of Christ ponder this matter truly and with all diligence. Luther as well as the Zürichers are somewhat rough (in this controversy), but there is no need of their getting heated and making others suffer, but should act as more reasonable men and exercise a Christian patience. For should disunion once grow between Luther and Master Philip, —God help us! What would come out of it! How the Papists would glory and say, If a kingdom is divided in itself it will go down. It would also without doubt cause many Christian people to become offended and scandalized and many fall away from the Gospel. Oh Almighty God, what is the matter with people that they get up such hurtful and angry disputes. It is not a true apostolic spirit that does that, but such a spirit as seeks quarrel, division and brawl.²⁶

It was reported that Luther intended to publish an answer to Bullinger's book. The landgrave urged the elector to prevent it if possible, as the only people who profit by this strife are the Catholics. John Frederick then sent his chancellor Brück to Melanchthon, who said to Brück with tears that the Zürichers were a coarse and unquiet people, that if Luther got into this thing again his displeasure would mislead him beyond the Wittenberg Concord, and there would be a still worse division, and suggested that the elector suppress the controversy in Saxony and forbid the sale of Bullinger's book. When Melanchthon thus appealed to speak to Luther, the latter promised not to write a book, but only some simple articles to be laid for subscription before the evangelical Bund. But Luther was too near the end. Even that much he never did. Calvin urged Melanchthon himself to write on the Supper, an interesting indication of how much in common there was in the minds of these theolo-

gians, what a large common spiritual residuum there was at the bottom of the Reformed and Lutheran doctrines of the Supper. "I assert a hundred times," said Calvin in his last answer to Westphal, "that it is not possible for this cause (of the Supper) to tear Philip from me than from his own viscera." But of course it was no time for that. Melanchthon and Luther still continued as they had been for 30 years. In March 1545 he wrote a preface to the first volume of a new edition of Luther's Latin Works, in which he set him forth as a witness for the truth raised and illuminated by God. In the same volume Luther said of Melanchthon,—and in spite of the earnestness and even narrowness of Luther's theological conscience, it speaks volumes for him that though thoroughly familiar with Melanchthon's widening gaze during the last decade or two, he could yet say of him (in his own preface), after depreciating his own books, "that there were many text-books now for religious readers, especially Melanchthon's *Loci*, in which a theologian and clergyman could excellently educate themselves. What God has accomplished through this instrument, not only in sciences, but in theology, is witnessed by his Works, how angry soever Satan and his following may be over them." I think I have not quoted before the words of Luther taken down by Mathesius.

He who desires to become a theologian has the Bible; after that let him read the *Loci* of Philip, that is, get them in his head. When he has both, he is a theologian; to him all theology stands open. You can find no other book under the sun, where the whole theology is so finely ordered as in the *Loci*. Philip is more moderate than I, he defends and teaches; I am a talker, more a public speaker (*rheticus*). If people will follow me, they must only print those of my books which teach doctrine, such as (the Commentaries on) Galatians, Deuteronomy, John. Let the other books be only for history, so that one can see how it began, for at first it was not so easy as now.²⁷

27 Quoted by Köstlin ii. 594.

Besides his own bodily troubles, Luther was too much distressed by matters nearer home to write further on the Supper. There was too much moral disorder among students and citizens of Wittenberg. Perhaps to help this the law faculty of the University put forth a resolution which declared valid a secret marriage, concluded without consent of parents. This greatly embittered Luther, who preached mightily against "this upsetting of the divine law." Luther was so displeased over the jurists and over the general conditions in Wittenberg that he left the city and withdrew to Merseberg with George of Anhalt. Melanchthon was much troubled, and asked the elector to call him back. He himself went after him, and brought him back appeased. So he labored to be in all things a peacemaker. When somebody became offended at Luther he made peace, so that Cruciger (Professor in Wittenberg) could write to Veit Deitrich: "If Philip were not here, who keeps unity among us by his moderation and benevolence, the University would fall to pieces."²⁸

In 1552 ff. a strife broke out again on the Supper led by Pastor Westphal of Hamburg, who proclaimed Luther's doctrine in an extreme form. Although Luther believed in the ubiquity of Christ's body, that doctrine was not taken up in the Protestant confessions. Westphal and Timann of Bremen came out with a strong statement of it. Although Luther said once that the body of Christ was bitten with the teeth, this was not his usual expression. The mouth takes the bread, but faith alone takes the body and with it forgiveness of sins. That was Luther's usual way of speaking. But these zealous followers took an occasional extravagance literally, and built on it a far reaching premise which damned the Reformed and even Melanchthon, who called this new emphasis, bread-idolatry. Hardenberg, a preacher in the Cathedral in Bremen, opposed this extreme Luther doctrine, and he was at length driven out. Some councillors at Bremen asked the advice of the Wittenberg theologians, who contented themselves with warning Bremen against

²⁸ Corp. Ref. 5. 314. Feb. 15, 1544. Schmidt, 433.

untenable formulae and strange disputations, and keeping themselves to the Augsburg Confession. Both parties, and especially Calvin, tried to get Melanchthon to come out fully on the matter, but he declined. He never wrote another book on the Supper. From 1535 to the end of his troubled life he held steadfastly to a middle way between a High Lutheran and a Low Reformed view, viz., that the sacrament is a sacrament only in the moment of use, that the body and blood of Christ are really present to faith and are by it received as a pledge of our implanting in Him, that Christ is therefore really present in the sacrament, and by it is effective in us. But this is a secret mystery of grace, and is not physical. There is no material presence, or local inclusion, of the body. Christ is received with the bread, but only by the believer and by faith. Melanchthon gave up belief in a reception by the unbeliever. With Luther he sees in the Supper a guarantee of the possession of justifying grace. The Presence is not less real and substantial for being spiritual. What it was more particularly, Melanchthon avoided saying, emphasizing rather the practical religious significance of the Supper, and desiring to leave room for varying views so long as an objective Presence was held.

Drew Theological Seminary,

Madison, N. J.

ARTICLE IV.

CAESAR AND HIS SOLDIERS.

A Study in Wages.

BY T. B. STORK.

Veni, vidi, vici! Caesar's proud words of conquest were couched in the first person singular; he did not say "we" or "you," but with proud, if unconscious, arrogance, "I have conquered." It was not the Roman Republic, not even the army, but he, Julius Caesar, who had done the deed. Suppose one of his legionaries, say of the favorite Tenth, had asked, in popular slang: "Where do I come in; have I no share in this deed? You, for this work, will receive the undisputed empire of the known world. Am I to have only my pay, my allotment of land, for doing that which has earned you the world?" So we may suppose the argument to have run, raising thus in those early times the puzzling problem of how the result of man's labors, that is, wealth, is to be divided when produced by the co-operative labor of many workers in some common undertaking: for it is just here that the whole crux of modern economic problems centers—the unequal distribution of wealth, the relation of capital and labor—the rate of wages; in other words, all these are questions arising out of what may be called the personal equation, the individual ability of each man to do and to get. Caesar gets the world because he earns it, just as his legionary gets his stipend, and for exactly the same reason, and the relation of Caesar and his legionaries affords a striking, picturesque, yet perfectly just, illustration of the whole question; for the relation of labor and capital is always that of a vast army of workmen who, with the tools furnished and under the directions given by some industrial captain, or Caesar, go forth to conquer nature, to take from her useful and valuable things. What is to be done with these useful and valuable things after they are gotten, how they are to be divided in accordance with justice,

depends upon a proper statement of the relations of Caesar to his army, upon the question of how much his army has contributed to the joint product of their labors.

It is the contention of many economists that the laborer gets too small a share of the total product. One of the most popular of recent economists, Mr. Scott Nearing, thus voices the general opinion: "Always the thought is there in its most general form, carrying with it the possibility of revolt against any economic order which denies to a man the right to his full earnings."¹ Which means, I suppose, if it means anything, to assert that under present conditions the laboring man does not receive his full earnings. The dominating idea in the discussion seems to be that, since the product of modern industry, the accumulation of wealth by it, is so much greater than by the older and simpler methods, therefore, the laboring man should receive for his labor a share proportionate to the greater product, and that, without regard to how the increase in product has been brought about; whether, that is, the laborer has produced it or whether it owes its existence to other factors in the process of production.

Thus again, quoting the same economist, the complaint of the laborer is voiced to the effect that "Each year enormous payments are being made to the owners of property in the United States in return for their bare ownership; at the same time the workers whose efforts are responsible for bringing these values into being receive, in many cases, returns which sound like mere pittances."²

It must be conceded that the wealth produced by modern industry far exceeds the amount produced in the past and that of this wealth some classes of the community receive a very much larger share than others; whether justly or unjustly cannot, however, be decided off-hand on a mere comparison of the several amounts so paid. That every man should receive the full earnings of his labor may be conceded, but how are these full earnings to be measured? What is the just rule for dividing the results produced by some vast undertaking of modern industry?

¹ Work and Pay, page 49.

² Work and Pay, page 41.

This is the problem set before us and it is not to be decided in the off-hand, obvious way that some economists would have us think. The mere fact that men who are separately laboring each by himself could only produce say x valuable products, and that when laboring together in some great combination, and with the help of machinery, they produce, say x plus y products, goes not one step toward establishing the proposition that they should receive each a larger share of the product than before. It is true that there is a larger product to divide, but it does not follow that the individual laborer ought, of right to receive any greater share of it. We must first establish some principle or rule by which to measure justly the amount due to each laborer in return for his labor. What then is the just measure of wages, is the question we have first to answer. Fortunately there are certain well recognized principles by which we may guide our inquiry. One of these is that no laborer is entitled to receive one iota more than the product of his labor; this is so obvious that it seems scarcely worthy of a formal statement. Nature, which is the final paymaster of wages, pays in this way and only in this way. In uncombined labor, where a single man labors and receives the product of his labor directly, the matter is plain enough; he takes what he gets and must perforce get that and only that which is rendered back to him in answer to his exertion; the fisherman gets his catch of fish, the farmer takes his crop, and there is an end; if they get little or nothing, there is no question of justice or injustice, it is merely niggard nature that has failed to reward their labor, and in the most complicated and elaborate operations of modern industry, however, apparently different, the rule is practically the same.

Nature is the paymaster in the last resort of one as much as of the other, and so we can easily see that the just wages of the laborer is what his labor has produced, no more, no less. It may be more difficult to ascertain what this product is in the latter case; great and complicated operations involve so many elements that what share, say of a railroad or a steamship or a canal, any one

laborer produces may be very difficult to measure. But mere difficulty in applying the principle is no reason for impeaching its validity. Whether it be railroad, steamship, canal or what you will of joint product, the laborer is entitled and only entitled to that share of the final product which his labor has produced; that is the law of his labor by himself and there is no change wrought by the mere combination of many laborers together in a joint effort, however complicated and extensive. If we would know therefore, the just amount of product or wages that are due to each laborer in a complicated undertaking, we must ask what each has contributed to the final result. And the very first point that meets us on the threshold of our inquiry is this: that the laborer contributes no more exertion, exercises no more intelligence, but often less, than when laboring alone; he runs, as we shall notice hereafter, less risk; he is subjected to less hardship in many cases; on what ground, therefore, shall we attribute to him any more efficiency in producing the final product; why should we credit him with any increase of the amount of the product?

What then is the factor responsible for the great increase in the product of these combinations of men and material? The answer is in one word, Caesar. It is because theorists, labor agitators, political economists have neglected this, the crucial point of the whole matter, that many of the difficulties of great wealth, meager wages, disparity of the conditions of rich and poor and the discontent naturally resulting therefrom have arisen.

It is the exercise of their powers of leadership, of command, of executive capacity, foresight, judgment, whatever you choose to call that transcendent and rare power possessed by some men to manage and handle great enterprises, to carry to a successful conclusion some difficult and vast undertaking that gives Caesar and his like their great share of the results they produce. Without them and the vast undertakings they make possible, no surplus value, no wealth properly so called, would ever come into existence. This is no fanciful idea, no imaginative theory, but the cold, hard reality that we meet every day in the

world. The wages of Caesar, his share of the results of these great undertakings, is his because he earns it. It is Caesar and his like who make the difference between success and failure. Caesar's soldiers were not better than Pompey's at Pharsalia (they were less than half in number); they were no braver, no stronger or more clever, yet they won the victory. What was the deciding factor, what gave to them victory, and to their opponents defeat? There is but one answer, it was Caesar. French workmen are not inferior in strength or intelligence to the American, yet they failed to build the Panama Canal, which was completed by the Americans under Goethals. It will hardly be contended that the deciding element, the factor that made the undertaking successful was the change of workmen; it was Goethals who did the work, with no better men nor any greater strength of muscle. Or, changing the point of view a trifle, let us see what happens in Caesar's absence. What ails desolated, war-torn Mexico today, and what has been happening there for the last two or three years, but the search for a Caesar, for some man who can bring order out of chaos. How much did the presence of Diaz, the alleged wicked, unscrupulous Caesar of that country, add to its material wealth, to the comfort and commonplace happiness of every man, woman and child, who could under him, at least enjoy the great boon of security of life and property! How many lives and how much material wealth have been lost by the absence of his hand from the helm of power!

The continuous anarchy, misery, starvation of men and destruction of property show how rare is the efficient and real Caesar who has the capacity and ability to handle great undertakings, governmental or industrial. What would not the Mexicans pay for another Diaz? What would not even the day laborers pay out of their wages for the security and the opportunity of laboring which another Diaz might afford? Or again, what would have been the worth to Great Britain of a Caesar at the Dardanelles? How many thousands of valuable lives, sacrificed for no purpose, might have been saved! How much

suffering and misery of a prolonged and wearing war might have been avoided; how much actual wealth have been saved! How many army corps would Germany consider equivalent for a Mackensen or a Von Hindenburg?

We realize in these striking instances what Caesar means in some of his more conspicuous functions, but we must remember that in modern industrial organization in a comparatively smaller degree, and gradually growing smaller as we descend the industrial scale to lesser enterprises, the same rule holds good. Caesar plays his part and earns his reward as truly. What then is the measure of such a man's wages? Must it not be the efficiency he shows in producing results, and is he not justly paid a generous share of the product which he himself produces? It is on this that the whole problem of wealth, poverty, living wage, turns. Unless you deny to Caesar his right to exercise unrestrained save by the old legal maxim *sic utere tuo*, the gifts which nature has given him it is hard to see how you can deny his right to the wages earned by these gifts. If anything is his, surely the natural powers and ability of a man are his, and if they are to have any value surely there follows the right to exercise them.

In earlier times with primitive conditions of production, when each man labored by himself and there were no great combinations of men and means, there was no place for Caesar; no opportunity for the exercise of his powers. Nor on the other hand were any great gains of material wealth made. Such conditions made no demand for Caesars; their exceptional powers were unknown and uncalled for. Just as in primitive warfare, in the combat of brute with brute, there was no call for a Julius Caesar or an Alexander of Macedon. In single combat with Goliath, Julius Caesar would probably have little or no advantage over the ordinary soldier; his surpassing ability as a great commander would there have no room for display; in a rough give and take of blows, it would have no effective part. But once put in his hands a Roman Legion with its thousands of men, and his great gifts, the like of which have only once or twice in the history of the

world appeared in the person of a single man, would find their legitimate sphere of action.

So in the world of industry, Andrew Carnegie, Rothschild, Rockefeller, Goethals, Shonts, Hill, Huntingdon, Harriman, Herr Balin, whomsoever you please to name of the organizers and captains of modern industry, would probably accomplish little more than any other ablebodied laborer in those primitive occupations of fishing, hunting, or cultivating the soil with spade or shovel, which were the original labors of our Adams and Eves, but in modern highly organized and vastly capitalized industries, these men find their opportunity and their necessity. They are as essential as Caesar to his army; without them modern industry could not exist.

Here then we find the cause of the greatly increased wealth of modern times: first, in the combination of labor and capital in large undertakings, and second, in the management of these industrial Caesars who are essential factors; so essential indeed that without them such undertakings would be impossible.

Side by side and coincident with these combinations there has occurred a very significant change in the use and management of private property by its owners, a revolution so gradual and natural that it has escaped special observation. Even as late as one hundred years ago the owner of private property, the investor who wished to get an income from his acquisitions, bought land or houses, or if he wished a less substantial, more liquid form of investment, he had recourse to ground rents, mortgages, loans to individuals or to the State, and there his list of investments perforce ended; there was little else. In all these, save perhaps the loans to the Government, he was perfectly alone in his conduct of his affairs; he was his own captain of industry, watched his lands, cared for his houses and his loans. Now all this is changed. The modern capitalist, for the most part, puts his money with easy confidence in stocks and bonds of innumerable corporations varied and different as the various tastes of the individual investor. Whether this change in the management of

private property is a cause or a result of the contemporaneous change in industrial undertakings may be a question; possibly the relation is reciprocal, and it is in part cause and in part result. The significant point, however, lies just here; that by so doing the private investor adopts the Caesars as the managers and captains of his property, makes them his agents, and so in a degree and to some extent, becomes entitled to share in the gains and profits of Caesar, or of course to share his losses and failures if so it should turn out. Whatever he gets of large gains is through Caesar's skill and ability thus vicariously employed to handle his property. The share paid to property or property owners out of the industrial product is not, therefore, as some economists would have us think, paid for some dead thing, but for an active service rendered by Caesar's use of property. Property does not stand idle, a great Moloch devouring all the product of labor without any activity or return on its own part. Under Caesar's management it is a live thing performing prodigies of work otherwise impossible to be done. Property that renders no service gets nothing, untilled land, uncut timber, vacant city lots, idle machinery, empty ships, pay nothing to their owners.

The problem of wealth and poverty comes back therefore to the personal equation, to the difference in personal ability. The laboring man gets the smaller wage because that is what his labor produces, what, if laboring alone, he could get by it. The question of living wages, of moral or legal rights has no place; for nature, the real and final paymaster of wages, does not suffer it. Nature pays wages to capital and labor, to Caesar and his legionary, not according to any rule of moral right; she simply pays or refuses to pay, and that is the end of it, without any regard to consequences either to Caesar or to his legionary; their survival or destruction is a matter of complete indifference.

Observe that it is not according to the amount of his labor, but merely according to his efficiency, that each man is paid; that is nature's method and we alter it at our peril. Nature pays by success and by success alone;

whether in early and simple, or modern and complicated industries. She puts every one back to the grab all of primitive living in which there are no rights, no sentiments, simply "has" or "has not."

Karl Marx, the great apostle of labor's rights, looked at the problem from quite another point of view; he did not ask the all-important, and as it seems, essential, question, how are wages paid and by whom, but chose to regard the formal bargaining of the employer and employee as the essential elements in the problem. It is quite legitimate to take this view and to work out the problem as a sale of labor or laborer's time to the employer, but it does not seem so fruitful a conception as to examine how wages are really paid and from that to proceed to a discussion of the true measure of wages. When a laborer works by himself, obtaining by his own labor useful things from nature, we know very well how and in what manner he receives his wages and their measure. That any great change should be wrought by his working with others and on a larger scale, does not seem probable since he does no more work and makes no greater exertion than when laboring alone. For wages under all circumstances are paid, as already noted, by nature and by nature alone; they are the uncertain rewards received from nature by labor. Note the adjective; it is of high significance. When laboring alone, dealing directly with nature so to speak, it is a matter of uncertainty whether the laborer gets what he seeks, his wages, or not; if he fail, not the most wrong-headed labor agitator would exclaim at the injustice or the unfairness of his case.

Now one of the most important features brought about by the combination of laborers in a single undertaking, and their payment by an employer, is the removal of this uncertainty. The employer takes nature's place and undertakes to pay the laborer surely on a day a certain fixed wage. The advantages of this to the laborer needs no comment; immediate payment is to him a necessity. In other words, the true view of the wage problem is that no labor is paid except in results; that without results, the best labor goes unpaid; that the employer buys from

the laborer, not his time nor his labor (although he may measure his payment in those terms), but buys the laborer's share of results and he buys the result at once, every day as it is produced, and takes upon himself the risk of there being any useful final result. It is only out of results of the labor that the final payment is made; he advances the payment and expects to be reimbursed from results; without results he would soon lose his ability to pay. He buys from them their share of the results which nature is expected to render in return for their combined labors and his payments are merely payments of anticipated results. How often captains of industry fail to get results; how often great enterprises, upon which millions of money and thousands of men have been employed come to nought, thus making waste of both capital and labor, need not be particularly pointed out; canals that do not get dug; railroads that are but streaks of rust; ships that will not sail; machinery and inventions that do not work; the thousands of experiments that are continually going on in the industrial world and coming to nought after perhaps years of patient toil; these testify to the risks taken and the burden placed on the Caesars of these laboring armies.

If it be argued, as it might well be, that every workman is as much under Caesar's direction as the property placed in his care, and should, like the property, share in Caesar's results, it must be pointed out that there is a fundamental difference. The property in Caesar's hands shares Caesar's fortunes; like Caesar it is paid only in final results, results that are uncertain, and distant, depending upon the success of the undertaking, and getting nothing if that undertaking fail. While the laborer's wages are paid in any event, and immediately, he does not share Caesar's fortunes or take the chances of final failure. This is not a trifling, but a fundamental difference, and it turns on that personal equation which is the very crux and pivot of all modern economic discontent. One man in a thousand has the ability or genius, the judgment, what you will, of natural endowment, to conduct what he undertakes to a successful issue. That

quality is of inestimable value; we need not trouble ourselves explaining why or what it is, suffice it for our purpose that some men have it, and that it is of all degrees, from the ability to conduct a shoe store or a grocery, to running a railroad, building a steamship, or conducting a military campaign. On the other hand, there is a corresponding want of this in the average man; a disability to see further than his nose or think beyond the working day. Give a man so wanting a store or a railroad, and no matter what the number of millions put at his disposal, he and those with him would have nothing after a few years. This is no theoretical statement, but a sad and practical truth. If we face the truth we will see that the average laborer or working man is not capable of earning more than his daily wage; that is all he could get by himself; why should he, in the name of justice, claim more when working no harder in collaboration with others? It may seem a Democratic treason to state the bold facts but the average man is stupid in many ways. It is a saying so well and universally accepted that it commands our respect, that out of one hundred men in business, ninety fail. Those who have studied the problem of poverty scientifically, declare that much of the suffering and poverty are due, not to fortune, but to personal failings. If we wish more specific evidence of the average stupidity, look at the patent medicine advertisements, the get-rich-quick schemes, the various swindles that flourish to the extent of millions of dollars taken from the average man who knows no better. Nothing is too crude or too foolish for some people to believe. A hospital physician relates that a patient was brought in on one occasion redolent of kerosene, of which he had swallowed a tumblerful because some one told him it was good for a cold. Another on some like statement swallowed a bottle of liniment.

In plain words, these inequalities of fortune, these vast discrepancies in wages paid to Caesar and to his laborers, are the result of natural, not of artificial, unfair, human contrivances. All the facts point this way if we examine them impartially; a man gets wealth or suffers poverty, not because of unfair rules made by society, but because

and in proportion to his ability to render useful services to society. The man who really is of use very soon is rewarded to the full value of that use. Here at random are a few instances from the daily papers, giving initials only, of the men: F. W. W. started at \$8.00 per week in a lumber yard, not the pay of an ordinary day laborer; he is now head of several businesses at a salary of \$30,000.00 a year. W. A. G. was a telegraph operator at \$26.00 per month; he is now president of a great railway at something like \$50,000.00 a year. C. H. M. in 1881 got \$1.25 per day as a section laborer; he is now president of a railway company at \$50,000.00 a year. These, in other words, were all Caesars in their little way, and for want of them the enterprises of modern life would all go astray. There, for another example, was the great undertaking of the New York subways, involving capital expenditure of three hundred millions and over; all was confusion and chaos until Shonts was begged to take charge at a salary of \$100,000.00 a year. What is true of these striking examples is true in a lesser degree of others, who, according to their ability, have received proportionate rewards in wages. In other words, opportunity often lacks capacity; capacity seldom lacks opportunity.

All this is purely theoretical by way of answering the general and sweeping objections made to the great wages or wealth of some industrial laborers as compared with the small wages or poverty of others. That laborers are sometimes paid less than they deserve, that their needy situation may be taken advantage of by unscrupulous employers, impeaches not at all the validity of the general argument. Unscrupulous men in all walks of life take advantage of their fellows; one Caesar robs another just as he robs his employees. Notwithstanding all of which the great natural methods of payment of wages to efficiency and by results prevail and govern the relations of all laborers to each other.

What is the just measure of wages in any one instance may be very difficult to ascertain with any degree of accuracy. But when the cry of all the labor agitators is for

a just wage, surely the first question to be answered is, how and on what principles are we to proceed to divide the results of the joint labors of a great body of laborers; for it is only out of the product of their labor that any wages can be paid; labor without results gets no wages, and great results can only be produced by the great combinations of capital and labor, which require these Caesars to command them, and which yield to those Caesars the high rewards in wages which they get, while the laborer is paid, not as of old when he fished and dug for himself, by results, but by those artificial substitutes for results, the wages of the capitalist who insures to him his wages at once and with absolute certainty. These are all plain commonplaces that we all know, recognize for true the moment they are placed before us, for it is the law, not of man, but of nature, who alone pays labor and by this hard rule of success without regard to amount of labor or moral deserts. There is no dispensation from the rule so that all who would show the injustice of any given wages to the laborer must start with this premise or not at all; no eloquence or declamation can alter it.

Perhaps in a different world an altruistic, benevolent, but artificial society, those eloquent declamations about the rights of labor to various enjoyments might have place; in natural conditions they have no place, are mere dogmatic assertions. They have a life, a validity of their own, but it is in a wholly different sphere. They strike root in religion and in the altruistic feeling of which it alone furnishes the sure foundation. In the world of Socialists, labor agitators, anarchists, Communists and the like social reformers, religion which is the only basis for their altruistic doctrines, finds no countenance; they for the most part reject the religious attitude that all men are brothers and owe to each other love, kindness and goodwill. Their plea is for justice, and they often seek to enforce it by violence; they set aside as rubbish all the Christian doctrines of the brotherhood of man. Christianity being rejected, we are perforce compelled in our search for what is just, for what is lawfully the laborer's

share of products, to confine ourselves to the logic of cold facts, not as they should be in some altruistic state, but as they are.

If by our substitution of a human employer for nature and a method of payment other than by luck or chance or skill we give to the laborer certain advantages in certainty and in promptness of return to his labor, it is not logical that he should accept these advantages and yet complain of the burden that goes with them; he cannot have the transaction both ways; he cannot accept the certainty of an immediate result for his labor and claim at the same time the advantage of an uncertain future result, should that result eventually be obtained, but in regard to the obtaining of which he took no risk.

Philadelphia, Pa.

ARTICLE V.

THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION AS APPROPRIATED
BY SOCIALISM.

BY REV. A. J. TRAVER.

Twenty years ago Evolution was the battlefield of Christianity and Atheism. The word, innocent and harmless in itself, when defining a deistic philosophy becomes not merely a descriptive law of development. It neglects Providence and explains history as the record of an automatic, continuous and eternal movement toward some final state of society. Evolution is opposed to the idea that the world was created practically as it now stands and that new forms of life or new stages in the world's history are the results of new conscious acts on the part of a creator.

With evolution, as thus defined, this paper is interested. It is by no means a recent doctrine. Though Darwinism has become a synonym for evolution the ancient Greeks reduced matter to an original substance from which grew the latter and varied forms of life. Thales chose water as the original substance; Anaximines, air; Anaximander philosophized for moisture under the influence of warmth. He also threw out the suggestion that man is a development from lower stages of animal life. Plato and Aristotle suggested as a goal for development a certain sort of God-likeness while the latter mentioned the ape as the possible missing link between animals and man. In medieval times the Church Father Augustine used evolutionary methods in his treatment of history, and the free-lance philosopher of the wanderlust, Bruno, identified matter with form and used the law of continuous development. Coming down to modern philosophy, Descartes and Leibnitz use the same law in explaining progress. Leibnitz says, "The present is the child of the past, but the parent of the future." Kant entertains the thought that "an orangoutang or a chimpanzee may develop organs which serve for walking,

grasping objects and speech—in short that may evolve the structure of a man with an organ for the use of reason which shall gradually develop itself by social culture." Schelling follows Kant with a purer evolutionary theory of the relation of nature to reason. Finally in Darwin and Spencer we have the development of life in its varied forms wholly through the laws of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. Although the phrase "We may well suppose," occurs over 800 times in his two principal works, Darwin's fame rests in his use of ascertained facts as proof for his theory and in his clear statement of its principles. Spencer broadened the theory to include the whole range of nature.

The pronouncement of the theory by Darwin set the theological world agog. Science ranged against religion and religion against science. Extreme views of the one brought forth extreme views of the other. Only very recently have the rival camps been able in any measure to view their differences with calmness. Under the new and less excitable spirit of the age and under the leadership of such scientists as John Fiske, Newman Smyth, Geo. A. Gardner and Sir Oliver Lodge, the breach is being healed.

This paper is interested mainly with evolution as it has been related to the progress of society as opposed to the earlier and most noticed application of the theory to the development of the individual. The Christian apologetes have attacked evolution mainly as it was used to explain the natural world and the origin of man, finding in this the destruction of Biblical accuracy. The bold assertion that the history of society shows a long line of continuous development under its own laws has gone comparatively unchallenged. It is strange that more emphasis has not been laid on this phase of the development of evolutionary thought. Darwin himself confessed that he obtained the clue to his theory while reading the sociologist, Malthus; while Spencer, always more sociologist than philosopher, traces even Christianity from a common origin with other religions in primitive ancestor worship.

But it was Karl Marx, patron saint of socialism, who was, Liebnecht tells us, the first to realize the importance of Darwin's loudly acclaimed theory to sociology. The

main principles of evolution he incorporated into his system, making it the scientific basis of socialism. We are not surprised then to read from the pen of that most gifted and readable apostle of socialism, John Spargo, that socialism is "in its modern sense a theory of social evolution." Christian apologetics must gather new ammunition and devise a different type of gun. It was well enough twenty years ago to worry about Darwinism but today a new enemy faces Christianity. Out of Darwinism grew Marxism and though discredited or rather unnoticed at first the economic interpretation of history has been gaining followers by the hundreds in the 20th century. We trust that this paper will indicate that the most insidious as well as the most open and bold intellectual foe that modern Christianity must overcome is found not in Geology, not in Biology, not in Philosophy but in Sociology and specially in that theory of Sociology which is the heart and life of Socialism. The entrance of many Christians, both clergy and lay, into the study of social service and the accompanying theories of sociology has endangered thousands of untrained minds. The high sounding phrases of socialism with its championship of the weak and its war against poverty have appealed to the heart and imagination of the sincere. Underneath this innocent bait is hidden a barbed hook and many of those who have swallowed socialism have done so at the price of their spiritual life. The appeal to the nobility of service is but a veneer over the infidelity and rottenness of economic determinism. To expose this theory is the purpose of this paper.

In 1859 Marx wrote in his famous preface to "The Critique of Political Economy," "the totality of these relations of production forms the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which a legal and political superstructure rises, and to which definite social forms of consciousness correspond. The mode of production in material life conditions the social, political and spiritual life-processes in general. It is not man's consciousness that determines his existence but conversely his social existence determines his consciousness." In 1913 Prof.

Murdoch of Rensselaer Polytechnic in his book, "Ethics and Economics," proved the agreement of modern socialism with these principles of its founder in the following words: "Disarm it how one may, the pursuit of the economic direct and indirect, breaks through every manifestation of human consciousness for consciousness can not continue apart from food, clothing, shelter, the creation and distribution of the material means, instruments and products of economic activity," and on another page he affirms that "the foundation of the whole man is material. History is but the evolution of economics."

In "Socialism and the Present Day" Jessie Wallace Hughan arrives at a similar understanding. Socialism explains "the political and intellectual history of an epoch by the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange and the social organization necessarily following it and is often termed by the Socialists 'the material conception of history or economic determinism.'" Prof. Vedder, a sympathetic critic of Socialism sums up his understanding of the doctrine in "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus," as follows: "The basic problem of man in all ages has been the problem of subsistence, how to get a living out of the earth. The primal necessity has conditioned and directed all social development. The conditions of physical life, the relations of production to consumption are prime factors in human progress. The transformations of society, the growth of institutions are all traceable to economic conditions and all history is at bottom a struggle between nations and classes for the control of the means of subsistence."

Very often the unwary will be led to believe that Socialism does not teach rabid materialism but recognizes spiritual forces as effective agents in forming society. However in practically every case the Socialist apologete if driven to the wall will admit that while ideas are often immediate determining causes for action yet the final cause is material. Criticising Prof. Ely, Spargo writes, "'All that is significant in human history may be traced back to ideas,' he says, truly all that is significant in human history may be traced back to ideas but in like man-

ner the ideas themselves may be traced back to materialism." Labriola, another gifted Socialist writer, in his "Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History" frankly maintains that "It is not the forms of consciousness that finally determine the human being but it is the manner of being that determines the consciousness."

For a moment then let us put on the amber colored spectacles of socialism and read the pages of history. Spargo holds that assuming the life of the race to be 100,000 years at least 95,000 were spent in a crude tribal communism. At length out of tribal wars the inspiration came that a live enemy in captivity had economic value. So arose slavery and with it developed a leisure class. This latter class gave us Grecian art and commerce. In the days of Rome luxury demanded heavier taxation on land and slavery became less and less profitable. Great estates broke up and numberless slaves were freed. Thus serfdom was ushered into the world. This developed into the feudalism of the middle ages. God was the great King, to earthly kings He entrusted the land, these in turn for tribute trusted their lands to barons, the barons to lesser nobility, they to freemen and they in turn to the serfs. The whole reason for this change from slavery to feudalism was economic. At length free laborers found profit in specialization on particular trades and co-operation with their fellows. The trade guilds followed. Then wealthy families began to furnish materials, tools and workshops and the age of capitalism was on. Finally capitalists found profit in co-operation and the modern trust was born. And now looking to the future the socialist claims no fears from the concentration of capital, believing that just as feudalism followed slavery, and capitalism followed feudalism, so socialism will inevitably follow capitalism. As another writer, Loria, in the "Economic Foundations of Society" points out, "The ultimate economic form, while presenting the highest stage of development and nearest approach to perfection will at the same time differ less than any of the preceding systems from the primitive social structure."

This resumé of history may not seem particularly dan-

gerous at first glance. The economic motive seems to be present in each transformation of social form. But how does this general theory affect our understanding of the more specific events in history? The discovery of America was not due to the idealism of an inspired dreamer but to the economic necessity for another route to India. The American Revolution, as a certain socialist points out, was not fought for an ideal, liberty, but for the very material question of taxation, to quote: "Its roots were in the economic discontent of an exploited people." The Civil War arose because slavery was unprofitable in the north and had nothing to do with any doctrines of human equality except in-so-far as such doctrines were the reflex of the economics of the situation. The Spanish-American War was brought on the nations by a group of capitalists owning lands in Cuba and Porto Rico and such spiritual causes as sympathy and love of justice were blatant hypocrisy.

Logically, the socialist has not forgotten the great religious movements of history. Says Spargo, "to affirm that Luther created the Protestant Reformation is to ignore the great economic changes consequent upon the break-up of feudalism and the beginning of a new industrial order." Labriola, still more in detail, affirms that "Martin Luther never knew as we know to-day, that the Reformation was but an episode in the development of the Third Estate and an economic revolt of the German nation against the exploitation of the Papal Court. He was what he was, an agitator and a politician, because he was wholly taken up with the belief that made him see in the class movement which gave impetus to the agitation, a return to primitive Christianity and a divine necessity in the vulgar course of events. With the study of remote effects, that is to say, the increasing strength of the bourgeoisie, of the cities against the feudal lords, the increase of the territorial dominion of the princes at the expense of the inter-territorial and super-territorial dominion of the emperor and pope, the violent repression of the peasants and the properly proletarian movement of the Anabaptists, permit us now to reconstruct the authentic his-

tory of the economic causes of the Reformation, particularly in the final proportions which it took, which is the best of proofs." So does Socialism dispose of a great religious movement which we have held almost with reverence as the outgrowth of the inspired ideal of religious liberty in the heart of a great good man. It is to be explained not from anything so spiritual as the directing hand of God, rather do we look for its first cause on the high spiritual (?) plane of "victuals and drink."

But surely there is some great movement that is purely spiritual, some great man who rather than being merely the reflex of the age is an inspired leader drawing his power as well as his plan from his communion with a personal God. Permit Loria to answer this question: "We may therefore say with truth because it is an undeniable fact, that economic motives did predominate on Golgotha . . . since it was the reaction of property against threatened socialistic reforms that brought Jesus to the cross." Logical conclusion of economic determinism, Jesus, teacher of liberty, equality and fraternity, champion of the people against privilege, dies for the sake of the menaced pocketbooks of the wealthy. The cross then stands eternally as the emblem of the first victory in the wars of the classes. If the fountain head of Christianity is disposed of, thus, what of the field of present day religion? Socialism can hardly be charged with interest in heaven, the Kingdom of God being a material goal. The clergyman and theological professor, Rauschenbusch writes, "The spread of evolutionary ideas is another mark of modern religious thought. It has opened a vast historical outlook backward and forward and trained us in bold conceptions of the upward climb of the race. It has prepared us for understanding the reign of God, toward which all creation is moving. Translate the evolutionary theories into religious faith and you have the doctrine of the Kingdom of God." With him agrees that infidel teacher of our youth, Prof. Murdoch. Religious activity is to be found "not in the pursuing of merely abstract ethical and religious principles—usually derived from and reflecting an antiquated economic status and misapplied

to the new conditions—but in putting power at the right point, namely the material economic connection of the individual and of society. Change these, wait patiently on natural selection and the desired result will surely follow: or better said, use the reason that can foresee the effects of nature's processes and with clear intentions further the inevitable outcome." This is the sum and substance of socialistic religion, social amelioration. This is the kind of doctrine that is not proclaimed upon the house tops. But taken from their own textbooks, the economic basis of society is the scientific foundation of the system of socialism, and the paper so far has simply attempted to arrive at their definition. "Here," in the words of Washington, "perhaps I ought to stop." However there are certain outgrowths of economic determinism, partially treated in defining the theory that might be considered more at length. These show socialism to be not only inherently anti-Christian but also dangerously degrading.

In the first place economic determinism is materialistic, occupied with this world only. The logical believer freely admits with Keir Hardie that "one of the basic principles of socialism is ultra-materialism." The soap-box orator despairs the church as being other-worldly, a dreamer's religion, an apology for things as they are and should not be, the dispenser of a salve to soothe the suffering of humanity rather than a bitter enemy of conditions which allow this misery. Prof. Karl Pearson, writing in the English "Free Thought Magazine" says, "The modern socialistic theory is based on the agnostic theory of the supersensuous. Man is concerned only in the present life . . . not from fear of hell, not from hope of heaven, from no love of tortured man-god—but solely for the sake of society." The Italian Ferri accords with his English brother that "Socialism tends to substitute itself for religion because it desires that humanity should have in itself its own terrestrial paradise without having to wait for it in a 'something beyond' which to say the least is problematical." Added to this is the testimony of Prof. Flint in a volume called "Socialism." He writes, "Its ad-

vocates assail the belief in God and immortality as not only in itself superstition but as a chief obstacle to the conception of their teaching and the triumph of their cause."

What a joyous doctrine they teach. Bald materialism. "Eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." "Dust to dust, ashes to ashes" dreamers, we are called, yet if ever there was a wild dream it was the dream of the man who saw a world-brotherhood, founded on materialism. If death ends all, then might makes right, selfishness is a virtue and co-operation is a name for the yoke that binds jealousy to suspicion.

Materialism is the religion of pessimism. What wonder that Vida Scudder writes toward the latter part of her book on "Socialism and Character." "In looking back over the field traversed by this book it may seem to some as if our argument had fallen away from the high religious grounds taken at the outset and sagged down to the level of mere economic discussion." Certainly some apology is due the patient reader who hopes for comfort between the covers of a volume dedicated to Socialism. For to sign under the Red Flag means the renunciation of faith for sight, of bright hope for joyless resignation, of God-inspired love, for frank egotism. The explanations of Socialism do not explain, the enthusiasm of Socialism does not encourage and the doctrine of Socialism, if true, in the face of a real live personal problem like death would not be worth the price of the red rag that flies over them.

Again there is the sister doctrine to materialism, fatalism. It involves the denial of Providence as an active agent in history. This belief like many of the central tenets of socialism, finds its inspiration in the writings of the speculative philosophers. For instance Leibnitz says, "Those who assume that the Creator constantly intervenes in his work regard God as an unskillful watchmaker who cannot make a perfect machine but must continually repair what He has made. Not only does God not intervene at every moment but He never intervenes."

This belief was incorporated into socialism at birth. Prof. Vedder calls Marxism, "Calvinism without God." He adds this criticism, "This idea of Marx if true would leave no place for the ethical indignation that he frequently shows over economic wrong-doing." Modern socialistic views are perhaps best stated by Loria, "Human necessity is subjected to laws of its own which develop automatically and against which man can not rebel."

This is not the kind of argument however that is dealt out to possible converts. Spargo becomes indignant at the thought of the charge that socialism is fatalistic. Why, he affirms, we recognize all complex feelings, emotions, aspirations, hopes and fears common to man. But we really understand him better after reading his whole argument and finding economic causes behind these complex feelings. The English brother Blatschford is frank if not so polished when he writes in the Clarion, "I deny the existence of a Heavenly Father, I deny the efficacy of prayer, I deny the Providence of God."

The Socialist then in his struggle for freedom, for equality, for brotherhood, turns his back upon the outstretched arms of God and chooses rather the mailed embrace of the jailor, he spurns the liberty of sonship and deliberately accepts what Spencer called "The New Slavery." Well has Father Vaughn, the Catholic opponent of Socialism declared, "Under Socialism even though men had plenty to eat and drink and wherewith to be clothed and sheltered, they would not be free."

What a precious pair of doctrines to take with us as clergymen into the homes of death. No heaven with its reunion joys and no kindly Providence directing the affairs of man. What wonder we find the vein of sadness but thinly veiled in the writing of modern socialists. Loria admits that "Economic determinism is 'a dismal doctrine' as our late lamented friend Dr. Laveleye remarked, which seeks to lower the human race in our eyes by showing it to be governed exclusively by sordid material interests. But alas! we must answer these belated moralists that the cynicism is inherent in the conditions themselves, which could not indeed be sadder—and not in the

minds of those who frankly set forth the things as they are." Labriola speaks in similar strain of the government of the world as "a divine comedy." Even that most buoyant socialist missionary, Prof. Murdoch, finds nature so cruel and inexplicable in her dealings that the idea of a Providence would send one to the mad-house. Just how he keeps out from the mad-house after disposing of Providence he does not tell us. It would seem that he must rest his mind on the golden text of fatalism, what must be, must be. If this explains the riddles of the universe he is welcome to the explanation.

One more sweet sister in the socialist family and we will rest our case. Socialism if not immoral is unmoral. It has no ten commandments. Standards of morality are not fixed but are the changing reflection of the social forms of the age. Speaking of the mutability of science, Prof. Murdoch says, "Wholly of the same piece is the emptiness of absolute ethics, eternal right, justice and goodness." Therefore having condemned the present social form, the modern socialist condemns the moral standards. Nay even more than this our present standard of morals, they tell us, is made up of "a series of regulations imposed by the owning class upon the laboring class in opposition to their real egoism." The people are then actually "handicapped by their inveterate morality." Benjamin Kidd is authority for the assertion that Bax defends stealing from corporations, such as railroads, telephone companies, etc., claiming that the law, "Thou shalt not steal" was made by those who have to protect their property against those who have not. We understand the following quotation from a socialist daily, "It may be convenient for Socialism, with a view to expediency to seek to confine the definition to the economic issue, abstracted from all other issues of life and conduct." The final moral law then is not truth but seeming expediency. Enlightened self-interest, not love, is the moral law of the final society. If so we want to know how it is enlightened.

The result of the denial of moral standards that are eternal is that each socialist attempts to construct the moral standards of the final and perfected form of so-

society. He then tries to live under that standard in the present. Result, each socialist has his own dream as to the final society and therefore there may be as many moral standards as socialists. He who lends to a believer in the pious doctrine of economic determinism takes his chance. Will he repay the debt? He says so. Does he believe in the old command "Thou shalt not bear false witness?" He says so. Well and good, but it might be safe to make sure the papers are legally drawn for after the bargain is made who knows whether it may not become expedient and in accord with the present state of his enlightened self-interest to forget his obligation, specifically since the lender made the law. This sounds harsh, it is harsh. In no sense would this paper question the average truth and honesty of socialists. But the point that is of interest is that socialism, founded upon materialism, fatalism and shifting moral standards offers a possibility of human brotherhood with about the same consistency as the socialist gentleman pays his grocery bill when he needs a new suit of clothes. Only so far as socialism is illogical could it accomplish its most worthy object, the federation of mankind.

This paper has already overstepped its intended bounds. We trust that the true nature of the intellectual foundation of socialism has been exposed. We admire the devotion as well as the ability of many modern socialists. But we believe there can be no compromise between their doctrine and ours. If there is such a hybrid thing as a Christian-Socialist we would not hold it malice. However we believe that in so far as it is Christian it is not socialistic. If Christian and Socialist find themselves working side by side for the same things, well and good, but the intellectual basis for the service is as different as spiritualism and materialism.

Finally, then, how shall we treat the doctrine of evolution as applied to history? It can be accepted only in so far as it is descriptive of God's method with the world and does not pretend to power to move itself. Dr. Wright of Oberlin, writing in volume 7 of "The Fundamentals" on "The Passing of Evolution," says: "Of this, as of every

other variety of evolution, it can be truly said, in the words of one of the most distinguished physicists, Clerk-Maxwell, 'I have examined all that have come within my reach, and have found that every one must have a god to make it work.' Indeed a Burbank is needed in the development of social forms just as in the development of plants. Just as the cultivated rose, neglected, will degenerate, so will man, under the grim law of necessity go down deeper and deeper into sin and its consequent misery. There are great steps to be taken in progress that need God's hand. Man travels up the stony steeps to a perfect society with his hand in the invisible hand of God. Slowly and painfully, with age-long steps, he mounts. Here and there across his path stretch wide chasms. Impossible it seems that he should cross. Civilization seems doomed. But taking a firmer hold on the hand of the Father, he ventures the leap and by a strength not his own man has past another world crisis. This is the Christian interpretation of history.

What a vast difference in view point. Socialism and Christianity both agree in progress as a law of life but while the one exalts soul, the other exalts the body, while the one depends upon enlightened self-interest the other bases its only reliance on God-like and God-inspired love, the one looking back sees the world developing under the laws of that blind God necessity, the other sees the hand of the Father, the one looking at the present sees the world running amuck in a continuous war of the classes, the other recognizes sin as the enslaver of all classes and discerns with spiritual eyes the rescuing presence of Christ, looking ahead, the one sees the dead level of co-operative aimlessness in which the reward for work is food and clothing, while the prizes go to the popular, the other looking forward sees the Kingdom of God, the communion of the saints, the combination of the children of the Heavenly Father, heirs through Jesus living under the banner of service and finding their highest rewards in the approval of the Father, their highest inspiration in the friendship of the Elder Brother, and their highest law a love that finds its highest expression in the cross.

To close with the words of that great Christian scientist, Sir Oliver Lodge, from "The Substance of Faith":

"The Kingdom of Heaven is the central feature of practical Christianity. It represents a harmonious condition in which the Divine Will is perfectly obeyed; it signifies the highest state of existence, both individual and social, which we can conceive. Our whole effort should directly or indirectly make ready its way in our hearts, in our lives and in the lives of others. It is the ideal state of society toward which we are striving, it is the ideal of conscious existence towards which all saints aim."

New York, N. Y.

ARTICLE VI.

INNER MISSION—ITS GOAL.¹

BY REV. W. H. FELDMAN.

Hamilton in his *Metaphysics* says, "His (man's) perfection and happiness constitute the goal of his activity." This I presume would receive the assent of everybody. It is one of those general statements that all can indorse, yet all interpret variously. This is the claim of the Christian, the humanitarian, the altruist, the socialist, and the vote-getting politician. Yet all of these differ.

When it comes to defining what sort of perfection and what kind of happiness is meant, then great diversity of opinion arises. However, we are little concerned as to what the world may conceive it to be, or how it seeks to attain its goal. We have a clearly defined and exactly prescribed course to pursue in order to reach our goal. It is this! Anything that is to bear the name of Christian, by that very term, has clearly set forth the purpose of its place and mission. Furthermore, this very name for Protestant, and above all Lutheran Christianity, means that it will and must find its authority and source of strength in the Word alone. Luther had this conception when he said, "Das Wort muss es thun." The Word must do it! This is our limitation, but it is also our power. The Christ we know came not to start a work that was to be finished by Him in His day, and then turn the world loose on another mad career of ignorance and folly, but He declared His work to be for all ages, for all conditions of humanity and every need of human kind. His Word stands for us, as Inner Mission workers, as the one superlative test. It is the touchstone of every act! When, therefore, we adhere most closely to it, then we accomplish most truly the happiness and perfection of mankind. The Word stands first.

The Bible and the teaching which our Lord proclaimed, and which is preached from our pulpits, is not merely a

¹ Read at the Open Conference of Inner Mission Workers of the Lutheran Church held in New York City.

set of well-defined phrases that are to be committed to memory; but it is also a book of service. With this book goes an actuating principle which the Holy Ghost inspires. This inspiration vitalizes every act that has been laid down in that book for us to do! Inner Mission service, then, is the explanation and application of the Word of God to the affairs of daily life as they are worked out in concrete acts in the world around us. In other words, Inner Mission takes its living principle and makes it a principle of living. It is, in a sense, another explanation and another application of the Word of God. This makes the Word a twice-born book for every Christian worker. It saves his soul and sanctifies his services.

Not only must it do this to be true to its Master, but it must do it also for its own sake! The Bible must be the motivating force of all service to keep it pure and free from grievous sins and errors, which so easily creep into our work at best; and which would play into the hands of the devil in the finest fashion, because it comes under the guise of religion, wears the badge of respectability and accepts the honors of piety. False principles cannot father true practices. Other services may fall away from their essential principles and not suffer harm, but in our work it means death. When we do it, we are not debasing the currency, but injecting a deadly virus that will kill and consume.

Furthermore, it must be true to its call for the sake of avoiding misunderstanding on the part of him or her to whom we minister! The worker must never shine, the Word must always be in the foreground. He who is blest must see that Jesus has sent it by the way of the "Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these my brethren" channel. We must never forget that there is a sin of false conduct, as well as a sin of false teaching of the Word! Practice may be polluted as well as precept perverted; and the old heresy that it makes no difference as to what you believe so long as the sufferer is helped, is all wrong in spite of all contradiction! All must be done according to the Word.

That Word to which we are to be loyal, shows us very

clearly what we must stress if we would keep in accord with its plan. I need hardly tell you that the whole scheme of that Word, from its first page to the last, is the glorification of the Saviour. The gospel of Genesis begins it and the song of Moses and the Lamb will be the unending anthem through all the eternities of the new Jerusalem. Christ first, Christ everywhere, "that Christ may be all in all." This holds true in a very special sense of Inner Mission. It is just as incumbent on us to say in our Inner Mission work, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified" as it was for Paul to declare it to the Corinthians. He is man's perfection and man's happiness; and anything we offer that does not include this Christ, yea, that does not put Him in the fore is not true to the high calling of our faith; nor to the Word that magnifies that Christ above angels and principalities and powers. We must ever seek, then, to glorify that Lord! The reason is not hard to find, for God the Father did it! And this is proof enough for us that we are right when we give Him the first place not only in our worship but in service, even as God gave Him the same from the very throne of heaven. This is, alas! not always done. An error exists here which, in many respects, resembles the false statement made by some who hold the Sunday School as equal to and some even superior to the Church; forgetting that the promise is made to the Church, not to the Sunday School. So it is here, when works of mercy are made more of than the Jesus Himself, then all is wrong. It is commonly put in this wise, "His creed can't be wrong whose life is right," but because a good thought has prompted it, that does not make it right. The story of the cobbler in Constantinople, who pitied the poor boys and made them shoes from leather stolen from his master is to the point. Particularly must we hold this before us, when we recall that we are striving to revive those who have lost their first love in Him and would not possibly need us, were it not for that fall. They must see Him, not us,—not even the act! Let us never forget what we said above, how that Word makes Him the chief concern! We still stand with

Paul, "Knowing nothing save Christ!" The glory of the Lutheran Church is that it makes everything personal in her system of salvation and begins with a personal Christ in the Scriptures, and insists on personal service to our fellowman because of Him.

In line with this assertion, we would further emphasize the fact that this makes for personal salvation, not only of the soul but also of the body! The man who is in need of material aid, must see in the cup of water handed him the image of Christ. "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed," so the epistle tells us. Then the world around us is merely a symbol made to embody and declare the glory of God and always brings us back to Him; especially if the beggarly elements have ensnared us and throttled our faith. So it must be with our service to man. Any service that does not make this truth shine will not do Christ's kingdom one bit of good, no matter how the body fares! It matters not what the world may say about it, our standard is fixed! There is no genuine uplift in the eyes of Inner Mission workers that fails to lead to the Christ! Honestly do we believe that there never was more money spent and less real charity done than today! Fat bodies may have lean souls! It is true, even as it was said by Him who hungered, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The cross uplifts the body as well as the soul! The world calls this fanciful.

Lest any might say that a too spiritual aspect is given to the matter of religion, we reply that the works of Jesus, Who went about doing good, will completely kill the force of all such criticism. The pages of Scripture teem with the deeds of help and cure that He performed. He knew, as none ever did, or will, how our bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost; but He also warns of the place it is to take in the order of importance! It decidedly comes second; but second in such a way as not to be *secondary!* If it is a fair comparison, we would use the words of Christ when referring to the commandments, "The first is, thou shalt love the Lord thy God

with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy soul, and the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The "like unto" is second not *secondary*. The second side of the sheet of paper is necessary in order to have the first. The reverse of a coin always goes with the obverse. This makes plain our controlling thought. We are to do the one for the sake and because of the other. Physical claims are legitimate because of spiritual ends and worth. The body is to be saved because Christ died for it and the words of the Scriptures are ever to be observed in rendering service, that "your whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless." The body, then, has worth because of the soul from which it cannot be torn!

It is well for us to note how the world is looking at this matter of the body. The physical welfare of man is being considered as never before. Its relation to capital and labor are subjects of deepest study on the part of those who are interested in the physical body as capital of the nation. Healthy men and women are a national asset. Men are beginning to see that a nation cannot afford to be sick; for instance, for business reasons! Health is being evaluated in terms of money, time, increased cost of production through delay, and many other phases. Legislative bodies are passing "Workingmen's Compensation Acts." Liability Insurance is a common form of protection against accidents! Safety devices are introduced to protect life and limb. While we would not offer any objection to any effort that makes for the betterment of mankind, yet we cannot blind ourselves to this truth; that while all this makes for physical security, it does not touch the deep, hidden needs of man; yea, rather, courts indifference in many ways and we fear, in other ways, makes the individual more helpless and godless. There may be ways to throw safeguards around man's body; but there is no way to insure his character from the deteriorating influences that are at work in the modern industrial world! To save his limb does not save his soul. We claim that any view which omits the spiritual aspect can only pander to the baser nature of man. We

insist that the elevation of man comes to a true fruitage only when he is lifted up out of sin. There is no safety device for sin. The keen competition of the modern business world, the enervating effects of the factory and the shop, the condition of modern housing, the craze for pleasure—indulged in by poor and rich alike, the sensitiveness that the intertwining of international relations creates, and many other factors that we cannot name at this time, are all at work to make the life of today more complex than ever before—but also more corroding than ever before! Material security usually leads to spiritual indifference! This does not frighten us in the least. It only intensifies our responsibility to give to the world the true solution for all its problems. This will never be done by minimizing the body; but rather magnifying the soul! Sin today is estimated too cheaply and salvation is despised. Therefore, we can best assert the appreciation of our own salvation by the services we tender to the cause of our fellowmen; always showing that the impelling force is the Word of God which says, "The Love of Jesus Christ constraineth us."

Beautiful as all this is, let us never forget that we are not free from temptation in this matter! The devil comes not as an angel of light except where his aim is to pervert the work of Light! This is of far reaching consequence. Charity misguided is a far more efficient agency of darkness than flagrant vice unrebuked. There are real dangers and it is well for us to know them. The first baneful tendency that we wish to touch on, is that for which the Roman communion stands—work righteousness. This, in its essence, is an external, material conception of religion. In this matter, it has the human heart thoroughly in accord with its contention. Man, by nature, wants to work his way to heaven. It is too humiliating to accept the grace of God as a free gift. Man's pride is wounded when he is told that he cannot win salvation! Tell him that he can do something to help a good, but only partially strong and loving God along, and this partnership with the Almighty at once appeals to the average heart! Nor must we think that this is con-

fined to Rome alone! If we but knew it, Protestantism is filled with work righteousness people! Therefore we must never cease telling them that it is not a favor to God when we help our brethren, but the outgoing love of Jesus in our own hearts seeking expression in service to another. In a very humble way, but truly, it is the word being made life again. We do it not to be seen of men, we do it not to be praised by the person helped; we do it not to protect ourselves against the inroads of vice or poverty,—a plea so often made by charity workers; we do it because it is what God would have us do!

A certain ingrained dislike and blind opposition to Rome may save us from drifting back to that Church; yet that will not save from work righteousness! There is a more deadly force at work in the Church than that, in my humble estimation, because it is doing its work and going unchallenged! That force is pseudo-Unitarianism. This is honey-combing the entire Church. Rightly do they of that Church say, speaking of many preachers, if they were honest, they would join our Church and preach in our pulpits. Pragmatism, so-called, is at work; and many sincere men who think they are right, who have the right name but the wrong notion, are deceived and deceiving others by doing those things that they think are the sum total of Christianity! They talk much of being practical and getting results. They despise the ethically ethical, as they would call it. Cause and effect, are favorite words with them. They want to see something done. These and many other catch-words, meant in all sincerity,—and all the more harmful because they are sincerely meant,—are at work in the Church to the detriment of souls. Laymen who are accustomed to do things, while meaning well, are often the arch enemies of the Church they undoubtedly love! These are impatient with any scheme that does not yield an immediate return like their several businesses! We must never forget "that the spirit bloweth where it listeth," and that this holds for the physical as well as the spiritual! Pragmatism wedded to cause and effect is external, whereas Christianity is inward and spiritual and beyond

the ken of the eye. This I conceive to be the gravest danger of modern Protestantism—and we will do well to avoid this most alluring form of work righteousness.

In the foregoing we referred to the attitude the world was taking to the workingman and his physical welfare, but we saw only a part of the picture; for we must mark its real incentive! We believe it to be an ethical materialism. This world is getting to be more moral and more godless at one and the same time! It is getting away from the crude forms of vice and sin as they are shockingly done and is assuming a certain amount of external culture. This is merely a veneer. Figuratively putting it, the world is deserting the mining-camp, with its rowdyism that is open and genuine, and adapting itself to the etiquette of Monte Carlo. The gang-men wear diamonds and have their nails manicured! Of course, the latter does not offend the canons of good taste! It is extremely proper—without touching the conscience or the soul. We will illustrate. For instance, manufacturers are wise enough to see that a drunken man is not as good a workman as a sober one. The latter turns out more and better goods and is not likely to cause accident to himself or the machine. The State is aroused likewise. Crime is costly and must be paid for! It is neither practical nor pleasant! In other words, the world sees that crime and vice—sin, as we would call it—does not pay, and for this reason it must be abolished! Every word of this is true; we long ago learned that “the wages of sin is death,” but we should note that it is the loss and not the curse that is bothering men in their efforts for material gain. We do not deny that some good is achieved (as man sees it) when such things are abolished; but the citadel of sin is unassailed! Sober infidels go to hell as well as drunken ones. While we are glad for everything that is right, let us ever be alert lest this specious form of work righteousness hoodwink us into believing that it is the cure!

We must also at this time declare ourselves on the question of “social service,” because it is the question of the hour. The reasons are not hard to find. The whole

world is at present aroused by the fearful social injustice that prevails. The cry of the socialist, for you must give him the credit for this agitation, has at last been heard. Housecleaning after a thorough fashion is the order of the day. Churches with their pastors are being drawn in at a rapid rate. That it presents many alluring features and is doing good after its own way, no one will gainsay; nor will we deplore any wrong removed as a consequence of this effort. However, we maintain that any work that is done collectively by Jew, agnostic, and humanitarian, with every form of belief and unbelief, is not and cannot be specifically Christian. We can't expect them to set forth the Christ. That wrongs should be righted none will deny; that good is done all will admit. Our confessions speak of a third use of the law, so we would speak of the double use of the Christian. That Christians owe something to the State as citizens is self-evident. But when their highest ideal has been reached, the Christ is still missing. We know no cure out of Christ! Justice is confused with salvation. We will use a statement from Walther's "Pastorale" to illustrate, where he speaks of what the perfect sermon ought to be. It ought to be so constructed that any one coming to the Church for the first and only time would know that Jesus is the Saviour of mankind. Applying this test I ask, if this state of perfection were attained, would men know by the change that Jesus is the Saviour from sin? Social service, too, aims at the perfection and happiness of the race; but what sort of perfection and happiness is it? Better live in a world full of social injustice with the Christ proclaimed, if it has to be, than a Utopia that is without a Christ! Again we admit that good is done, and we can see how God will overrule it for good. We know that God can make even the wrath of man work out His glory. We are satisfied that right will eventually win, but the issue here is, what special course shall we pursue to be true to our specific calling? We think it is this, to follow our well-defined course, allowing no side issues, no matter how important, to swerve us from the clearly conceived purpose that God has in our own specific

field; fearful lest the same become involved with the issues of the times and that the spirit of the world usurp the controlling place in doing our work! Since its aim is reform not regeneration, since its purpose is correction not cure, since it is desirous to improve what man has done and not to take what God is ready to give and to do, we must never confuse it with our work. *Social injustice is a result not a cause.* Social obliquity is due to sin and we know of no cure then for it other than Christ. Though it is not pleasant to say, it is, we repeat, but a species of work righteousness and in so far diametrically opposite to God's plan as we conceive the truth. We can't allow any strange fire on God's altar.

We have looked without—now let us look within!

While a great many misunderstandings prevail from without about the work of the Church, it is just as true that a great many things are emphasized not at all, or not enough, within the Church. This is of concern to us. Among them, I think, none has been so overlooked as the doctrine of the "universal priesthood of believers," as it is so clearly stated in I Peter 2:9, "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." Why is this? It is not within the province of this paper to discuss this subject from the standpoint of theology. Inner Mission is a practical matter and we wish to say that which, we believe, will be approved by all and therefore of common interest. We are in danger in our Lutheran system of being too idealistic, we are told; and it may be that observers from without can judge us and ours better than we can judge ourselves. I am satisfied that, from the theoretical point of view, all is as it ought to be with us, in a general way. We are free from sacerdotalism and the episcopacy craze; the form of government is in accordance with Lutheran ideals. We talk a lot about equality and not lording it over God's heritage, etc. and this is right! I fear with us the matter stands the other way! With us everything is put on the minister and he is lorded over! Yet, sometimes we do lord it

over the people, in spite of all talks about the rights of the congregation. Why? We do it sometimes because we lack men with qualification for leadership! Sometimes, I think, because we expect our laymen to be theologians! Be it as it may, I think all said and done, the doctrine is one sided with much for us to do to bring our people up to the true sense of their responsibility. The sense of its honor has been developed sufficiently. Glory is never a drug on the market. Of workmen there is a dearth. Priests have services to render as well as to be honored. It was so in the Old Testament; it is so with our High Priest in heaven at the present time, and it must be so in the church-life of today. The Book of Acts must come to its own and the possibilities of the diaconate, male and female, must be emphasized. There are certain services that the layman can not only perform, but which the pastor ought never to be asked to do! Are they doing it? A moment's thought will convince you that if our church life were properly developed this meeting would, in all probability, be in the hands of the laity and not of us ministers, for we are considering the work of the diaconate—the priesthood of service for the body! Is it not true that we have been expecting too little of them? And what do we expect? It generally consists of attendance at church, to contribute to the benevolent operations of the same, and to elect certain ones to the offices of deacon and elder, which officers very often have not the remotest conception of their honor and tasks; who know of their duties and powers almost nothing beyond the words used at their installation. Here is our great task! We must make the apostolic deacon a reality and not a fiction. The true return to the priesthood of tables will do more than anything else to drive the ice-cream table and oyster-supper out of the Church! When once we have aroused the consciences of our people to the fact that the work of the Christian Church is not confined to the pastor, elders, deacons or deaconess, that there is a place for each one of them as laymen, and that it is holy work unto the Lord, holy I say, not work-righteousness,

then we will have the dawning of a better day in the great development of congregational life.

Who can conceive what it will mean when we have a priesthood of believers who will believe they are priests of Christ and will work in accordance therewith? At present the average believer is in the vineyard, no doubt; but he is there to pluck grapes not to prune vines, bear burdens. When we stop to think of the vast deal of good that is done by the few who are interested, it staggers us to think what might be, with all the priests serving at their respective places. Let us bring before them their responsibility and help them to see their duty and privilege; always remembering that responsibility educates the moment it enlightens. The word gives us this right!

The charter rights of the priesthood springing from the Word, makes that Word again supreme,—as it should be. It therefore becomes us to guard sacredly the place of the preaching of the Word and the ministering of the sacraments. The chief place belongs to the spiritual. It must always be clearly understood that this ministry cannot supplant, neither can it be a substitute for the preached word. Many of our brethren still feel a little chary toward Inner Mission, fearing this very thing. We see on every hand the fatal effects of this work-righteousness spirit. That there is danger, we admit; but if it is firmly and clearly put under the Word, I think we are perfectly safe. That Word, we feel, is fully able to give the true perspective to the work, if we constantly emphasize the fact that all this must be done for Jesus' sake! That Jesus must shine as the bright, consummate star of the Scriptures, and that all else must cluster around him as the center of the system is the hope of our theology and the impulse of our service.

In the foregoing we mentioned the activity of individuals and their personal efforts. We all realize how much it means for them and for the Church; but we are dealing here with the Church which is the whole body of believers. We must distinguish between the services of the individual and the services of the Church. True, it will always

be the individual that will do the work, but he will do it from the congregational impulse and under the direction of the pastor. This is something different. Has the Church measured up to her task? That the Church, as a Church, has been woefully lacking in this matter is self-evident. One example will suffice. If Paul could write to a Timothy, "But if any provide not for his own and specially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel," then what about the Church? Shall the Church write such things to a member of the Church, and be guilty of the very selfsame thing herself? Yet this is true. Our orphans are in state homes; our indigent are cared for by the aliens; our diseased are looked after by the unbeliever; and our incurables are at the mercy of the world! This should not be! The Church has played infidel, harsh as it may sound! The very charge that Paul makes so distressingly black, is only deepened in its darkness when the Church supinely submits to this form of neglect. The Church as a Church must speak, not as individuals but as the entire body of Christian believers. This has not been done! Here we must make a confession of guilt. Let us not say that we need the world for this work! Some one has said, an excuse is an explanation for failure. Success explains itself!

In spite of what men say, the Church can get a hearing, and what is more, the world is ready to listen to our call. It seems many do not realize that the Church enjoys a unique position. Since it is not bound to any class or kind; for it espouses no form of polities; no code of social reform involving an economic program; no set form of governmental regulation, therefore it becomes, whether they admit it or not, the arbiter for all; the servant of all,—but the subject of none, when it exercises its full freedom and does its work as it should be done. But when it calls on the State for aid and uses its institutions; and seeks to make the State do work it cannot do, it prostitutes the high and holy calling of the priesthood of service that is its! The Philistine can then laugh at the Church shorn of all its glory and strength. We have

entered into an unholy alliance when we ask the unchristian State to do the work we are able to do and can reasonably be expected to do! We have sold out at a ridiculously low price, the beautiful wares of our faith. What is more, our members have a right to expect those services for the body that they now get from all manner of sources, such as the State, charity associations, lodges, orders, etc. May it not be, yea, we think it is more than likely, that if the Church had done its part, these would never have sprung up! Today, they who enter them are misled into the belief that they have all that the Christian Church has to give when they attend the services on Sunday! Leanness of soul results! This must be retrieved at all costs! This must be done for the sake of the souls who are deceived; for the sake of those who have so long been neglected; for the sake of the State which is honey-combed by "graft" in the name of charity; and lastly, because we have not honored the Christ, since we have not clothed the poor, fed the hungry, relieved the aged, nor cared for the orphan as we should. This, too, is patriotism of no mean order! Then we "fear God, honor the King, and love the brotherhood."

We are guilty, in my estimation, for much of this pseudo-charity that exists. By pseudo-charity, I mean, that form of giving that gives bread but puts the stone inside of it! That fills the fish with scorpions! We must, in season and out of season, declare that man cannot live by bread alone! However, we must never forget that Christ said, give ye them to eat! But more than that; we must not be guilty, as we have been in the Church, of saying, "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body," "what doth it profit?" If we are to speak of their pseudo-charity, then, alas, they are able to cast up to us pseudo-faith! There is still work for us to do!

As the great quadri-centennial is approaching, could there be a better slogan than this: "No Lutheran, an inmate of a state institution! Not a dollar of appropriation from the State to do our work of Christian love! Not a Lutheran uncared for!" Let that day come and

the Word will shine and be terrible like an army with banners, but its terror will inspire and its banners will win hosts! That day must come!

To hasten the day of greater things, we must concentrate upon an objective. That objective is to get more workers; and the center of emanation that lies closest at hand and offers the quickest assistance to the Church and the pastor is the church officer. We repeat, for emphasis' sake, a radical change must take place in the minds of the people as to the position and worth of the deacon and elder. In fact, this is true of all officers in Church, Sunday School and societies. They must be no longer handles but helpers. They must not confine themselves to the task of financing the Church, but go out into the highways and hedges seeking the lost and aiding the needy. Let us get away from the heresy that ministers alone must seek and help men. Let that day come and the mouths of the scoffers will be sealed forever on the subject of our other-worldliness. Eternally do they prate of this—because we have given them grounds for it!

There are a great many people who look on the Christian religion as a beautiful theory; and the followers thereof as a set of misled visionaries; whose hearts are right and whose heads are wrong! These persons are so impressed with the idea of earthly force and human strife, that they say the Christian life would be a nice thing if it only were possible! They must be disillusioned; and the way to do it is to show that the Church can work as well as sing; that it can serve man as well as God! That it knows not only of a heaven far away, but that it knows sin, its fruits, and the Saviour from sin; who starts heaven here and now! That other-worldliness this world needs; and it is our business to turn this world upside down and make it another world, even the world as Jesus would have it! But to do this, we must have a Church alive! Alive to the great salvation that is ours! Alive to the sin-destroying forces that are deceiving the world, with all that is in it! Alive to the fact that love grows by loving! That Christ is seeking to give expression of tenderness to the lost through those

who know what the love of Jesus is!—not only the preacher but the laymen as well. What joy awaits the layman when he learns to know that there is a ministry for him! That his religion is a vocation and not an avocation! That service is not something esoteric and belonging to a caste system, but the means whereby Christ wants to deepen his life and increase his faith as he serves for Jesus' sake! How far we are from this! We have been playing with the sand and losing the ocean. The Church has not used a tithe of her strength. The world can teach us a lesson.

The great conceptions that prevail in the modern industrial world are these three: efficiency, the saving of by-products and using the plant to its greatest capacity. Here the children of the world are wiser than the children of light! We have a perfect Niagara of strength and energy that makes nothing more than rainbows! I mean the great, unused power of the Christian laity. This is no time to ask, who is to blame? Let us try to right the wrong. It needs it sorely. The Church is divine, and no further proof is needed than the fact that it has done so much with so little judgment. "God is in the midst of her," or she would long since have ceased to exist! No business could succeed which would keep open one day and be closed for six, or use one-seventh of its strength; or have one man working and fifty enjoying themselves. Here as well as in many other things it is proper to say, "Yet I show unto you a more excellent way." But this will ever be so long as the pastor is alive and the Church dead. One live pastor is better than an entire congregation that is dead. But the Church ought not to be a cemetery. Who is the greatest in the leadership of the world? Not that man who does everything himself! The great merchant does not carry the mail to the post office; the great general does not dig the trench; though mailing and trenches are integral parts of the organizations. He puts men to work! He being all the more engaged because he must find work for others and direct the same. And he is greatest who gets

the most out of the unpromising! We must teach others how to do. A task that is not easy but blessed!

Inexperienced help is always vexatious; and the first impulse is to "do it yourself." It will then surely be done, and done the way you want it done. Lack of confidence in our workers has made us pay the penalty. This way is very shortsighted, though it seems very practical and wise. We forget that we were bunglers ourselves once, and it is surely true that practice makes perfect! No one reading the work of Paul can help but be impressed with the fact how he left congregations to themselves after a brief stay, letting them work out their own congregational salvation. Have we a trust sufficiently large and a faith sufficiently strong to do likewise? Let us sit at the feet of the mother. Here is the little girl anxious to help her. She wants to dry dishes, say. Now, mother can do it many times faster and many times better. But mother love knows that she can wait and endure the imperfection of her child. So she lets her dry them at the expense of time and thoroughness, but with the assurance that the child is being trained to service, and will become deft enough some day! So the pastors must take the layman. What if he does not do it as well as you do it? What if the matter is not so perfect? You are training a servant and a soul;—that is worth more than all the rest. All beginnings are bungles but they can lead to something better; whereas unused energy is not even a bungle—it is an unused talent which God and man condemn. There are possibilities in effort but none in non-activity.

"Lord, teach us to pray," was the plea of the disciples. Can we not hear the mute appeal of the layman today, "Teach us how to work?" The first step, of necessity, is to show them that there is work to do; that God is no respecter of persons, and that the Holy Spirit guides laymen as well as pastors, and that the layman can work for the Lord too! The first step up from slavery is to gain the consciousness that we can be free. The idea that our layman can do something will be the beginning of their doing it. Let no man deceive himself, though,

it must be real work! Let me say here, that I fear for the average church society. We try outings, "stags," moving pictures, banquets, even descending to boxing matches and wrestling, thinking thereby to interest our men! When will we learn that these baits are taken once or twice and then lose their charm forever? Why is it that every few years a new movement, a new league, a new club must be organized? Soon the gamut of change will be run. Then, what? Again we ask, why this change? It is because there is nothing vital enough to grip them. Ephemeral things can enjoy but a transitory existence. Today we cater to their desires for pleasure and they sicken of our diet. Could we but give them the vision of service and a possibility of usefulness—mark you, not as individuals but as a Church, a congregation—then I think the feverishness for novelty would die and work of permanent worth would take its place. But the laymen are not perfect, by any means, either! We must not overlook a weakness of our American people. We have an all-abounding confidence in ourselves that we are equal to any task. Our business men, at least most of them, have come up from the ranks and are self-made, possessing native shrewdness and are hard-headed and resourceful. They have an idea that there is no situation that they can't handle. Many hold in utter contempt the very notion of training "to do good," as they call it. They know what is good when they see it! This conceit has been a most prolific source of false charity which beggars and others have not been slow to take advantage of to the full!

Such men are the ones that cry loudest for social service because it appears to do good. They don't stop to consider the elements of the worth or the ultimate object to be obtained. It is to be deplored that we must speak thus, but these are the facts of the case. The man who would not tolerate a bungler in business will become the dupe of the shallowest scheme on earth where charity is involved. This applies to pastors as well as laymen!

At the risk of tiring, we want to repeat the statement made above, that we must ever be alive to the co-ordina-

tion of the layman's effort so that the guiding hand of the pastor, though unseen, perhaps, is nevertheless always felt. To do so properly, the pastor must enlarge his ideas of the layman's worth in church work, and the layman must be shown the central position of the words, "preach, baptize, make disciples." He must differentiate in his own mind the essentials of the two orders of effort that strive for the one goal by making Christ all in all. This will secure order and proper procedure.

Not only must he co-ordinate, but the layman and his work must be subordinate for the reasons set down before. The soul must be ever before both. Sin's removal must be ever the objective. Christ must ever be the Saviour and giver of eternal life. Again, with Paul, we must say, "I count all things but dung for the glory of God." We fear not those who destroy the body, but him who leads to hell!

In every walk and calling of life it is becoming a necessity to have training for the highest usefulness. It is not to be expected that the spontaneous preacher who despises the seminary and will depend on the Holy Spirit, is going to shoot a very strong bolt in this busy and alert generation! If this training is required for the preacher and pastor, it is just as essential for the lay worker. This training should touch the heart and the head through technical training in the best and surest methods. Now some of the heart training is in the disposition and early bringing up. The works of the teacher and the preacher, are seedtime sowings, and though it may lie dormant for years, it is nevertheless being developed by the Holy Spirit. The head training is largely a matter of reading and study in things historical where the Wicherns and the Fliedners, etc., will be the models and inspiration. It will deal with the apparatus and those methods and principles that have been tried out in applying the word to the exigencies of life. In this sense we may say that head and technique are somewhat one. Though we must ever bear in mind the limitations of the mental endowment of each man over which none has control.

While we are ever ready to develop a strongly trained

class as the most efficient force, we are not blind to the fact that work can be done by the untrained. The eye that lovingly searches for service will soon find some humble thing to do which gives the inward satisfaction that the Master is using the light He has bestowed to help another. Blunders will be made, to be sure. But who has preached the perfect sermon with all our training? Therefore, the educational system ought to be brought into vogue in every possible way. Here the societies of our Church and the various occasions that arise where the pastor is called on to preach or speak are an opportunity. The sermonic effort ought to be made a telling force when the proper time arrives. We must stock our libraries with the works that will serve the untrained and the trained and thus make the untrained to become trained, perhaps somewhat unconsciously. But above all, the pastor must give tasks to do. The theory of swimming may be all right, but a stream and an effort will go better and farther than all book knowledge. The pastor who carries on his heart the needs of the congregation can find many such instances of a practical nature where the spirit of loving service will find a ready outlet for its love. Let us begin with the children, so that they will know that they are a part of the priesthood of mercy and relief.

As we view the enormous amount of work that stares us in the face, we are constrained to say, who is equal to this task? Can the pastor do it? Yes, and he must. The future will expect of the pastor more executive ability and less oratorical. It will need more heart and head work and less foot work. He will be more concerned in keeping others busy than himself, for the services rendered will relieve him only to make him keep them at work by his intimate knowledge of the need of the congregation. In the future it will be necessary that he know his people more than they know him! He will, if he is wise, direct his reading to the end that he may know of the efforts and successes of others. His aim in studying the needs of his people will make him a specialist and

the best informed man of the community. The care of souls will teach him the cure of souls.

While the major portion of the work will fall on him, he will need those good drill-sergeants, the deacon and deaconess, to train the great army of workers that will be enlisted in the services of loving mercy. The multiplied ministry is a certainty in every church that intends to grapple with this problem,—that means the entire Church at work serving the entire need of the entire congregation according to the entire Word of God. Thanks be to God that we are not alone in this! Thanks be to God that He, who made the promise to the Church, is sure to lend His divine guidance. If ever there was a time when the ministry was inviting, it is now! This is the day that will usher in a new era and a better age; and happy is the man whom God gives the vision of the wonderful possibilities of larger services. To be a "soldier of the common good" is a signal honor; to be a leader should fill us with joy and trembling and make all titles and all dignities that man can bestow pale into insignificance! For we are co-workers with God and assigned to the noble task of leading many into the kingdom of loving services all for Jesus' sake!

York, Pa.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

"*The New Interdenominationalism*" is ably discussed by Dr. Alfred Williams Anthony in *The American Journal of Theology* (Oct. 1916). This movement is not wholly an American product. Dissenting Churches in England have their fellowship in various leagues and unions. In Canada there are prospects of even organic union among several distinct denominations. In the United States efforts have been made in the same direction. The most complete expression of the new interdenominationalism in the whole world is the "Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America" having a constituency of thirty denominations with about eighteen million communicants.

The causes underlying the movement are the sense of international brotherhood, the progress of democracy, the new scholarship, the spirit of toleration, the felt need of a social gospel, the new scientific dogmatism, a new literature, an economic impulse and an undefinable "drift" toward a common center, inspired perchance by the Spirit of God.

The perils of centralization should be recognized in order that they may be avoided. There is first the danger that the place of the individual be lost, as it was in the Middle Ages. Organization is also a peril. In union there may be a real lack of unity. Other perils are those arising from geographical localization, from diffuseness, dissipation of responsibility, officialism and the assumption of duties and functions which belong properly to the individual denominations.

The advantages of closer union are manifold and manifest. The spirit of Christianity is that of brotherhood, and as long as the Churches stand aloof from one another they contradict a great fundamental idea. Schism is a sin. In its testimony against error and false religions

the Church should speak with one voice. Comity needs to be practiced in the actual work of the churches. "Unless the Christian Church can act more nearly as a unit than it has in the past, it will be sidetracked from human affairs and its influence will be regarded as negligible, even while men continue to revere the Christ."

As to the future, Dr. Anthony does not claim to be a prophet; but he is quite sure that the laity will be more in evidence, that "theology" will give way to "a philosophy of life" and that the old tests of orthodoxy will be discarded. The members of denominational families will gravitate toward each other. The polity will probably cause two great groups of denominations, one congregational and democratic, the other episcopal. None of the federations now extant seem to be final goals.

Interdenominational organizations, such as The Y. M. C. A., have sometimes been thought of as the final form or expression of organized Christianity, taking the place of the organized Church. With all their excellencies such organizations have at least three fatal defects as final forms: (1) They lack historic continuity—ordinances, ministry, traditions and the sacred associations of the Church. (2) They overemphasize service at the expense of worship. (3) They are partial in that they generally minister to only one sex or class.

One may confidently say that in the future Catholics and Protestants will discover a common fellowship.

In regard to the foregoing we would remark that whatever the prospects of a general union may be the first and foremost duty of Lutherans in America is to come closer together among themselves. If we have interpreted the signs of the times properly the federation of the Lutheran Churches will not be simply on the ground of "service" but first and chiefly on the ground of a common "faith." That theology will be displaced by "a philosophy of life" is as improbable as the displacement of science.

"The Lutheran Church in Holland" is described by Professor Pont of the University of Utrecht in an article

in the *Constructive Quarterly* (Oct. 1916). It has had a checkered history, resulting from racial, linguistic and political differences as well as from rationalistic tendencies, resulting finally in a division in 1791 which remains to this day. The older or original Church is known as the "Evangelical Lutheran," and the seceders as the "restored Evangelical Lutheran." The former can hardly be considered a Church, being without a confession, embracing unitarians and some congregations not requiring baptism. There is no real unity among the members or the congregations, the only bond being Lutheran traditions. The latter seems to be truly evangelical, with inner unity and measurable outward uniformity. It has a confession which must be subscribed by its ministers. Its government is democratic.

"Christian Internationalism," by Henry Q. Hodgkin of London, in *The Hibbert Journal* (Oct. 1916) is one of the many saner articles which the various reviews publish in these disturbed days. He prefaces his discussion by saying "Whatever view we may take of the causes of the present world conflict, our eyes turn with eager longing to the future when we may begin to build for something very far better. Much is being written about a world-state, a league of nations, a league to enforce peace, and so forth. . . . The politicians and statesmen recognize that a plan for peace will not suffice unless it is accompanied by a change of heart." The war necessarily will leave various attitudes of sentiment against war itself on the one hand and vengeance on the other. Base motives of cupidity are also aroused by the powerful influence of the business opportunities which are stimulated by war. The peace of the world must rest upon deeper foundations than those which mere force may seek to lay. The only lasting security must spring from the religious instincts of the human soul. Nothing short of this will carry us forward to a righteous and enduring peace.

The first thing to do is to extend to other nations the ideas of justice and equity which prevail in the individual State. There is a basal-faith in an underlying world-

order and in the existence of a moral sense in mankind. This is recognized and relied on by all local government. The extension of this to all nations must underlie a world-state, if it is ever to be realized. The *second* thing to be remembered and cultivated is the idea that the human race is a family, and not a group of units each with a different aim and destiny. The selfish and barbarous theories that the "fittest" alone are worthy to survive is the misapplication in a most superficial way of biological phraseology. The Kingdom of God is not a mere theological dogma. The day has come to emphasize the idea involved as the great compelling ideal to supply the motive which alone is adequate to draw together, in one common welding purpose, the best life of men and women in all races. The *third* idea involved is that the common interests of mankind demand the co-operation of all races, for each needs the other to supplement its individual deficiencies. "There is strength and weakness in each unit, and it is by the mixing of these units in friendly emulation that all may be able to give their best and to discover their highest good." The *fourth* foundation principle must be sought in our Lord's teaching concerning love. The selfish policies of the nations are self-destructive. This is illustrated in the present European situation, which has been brought about by the false teaching that human society rests, in the last resort on physical force.

Professor R. E. Gaines of Richmond College, has some very sensible things to say about "The Layman and His Church" in the *Review and Expositor* (Oct. 1916).

"If the Church is ever to go forward in a concerted and aggressive movement for the upbuilding of Christ's Kingdom, there must be far more serious and systematic attention given to education. A man will give something of his means to an enterprise on the recommendation of his friends; but he will not put his life into it without definite concrete knowledge. Our leaders who are themselves for the most part well informed take for granted entirely too much knowledge on the part of the great body

of Christians. For example, the Church is a co-operative enterprise, and they suppose this is too obvious to need any emphasis. But evidently there are good people who do not think of it as such. You see we grew up with the idea that the Church is a sort of bookkeeping arrangement for recording the names of candidates for heaven. That matter having been attended to we have gone on about our business. We employ a church clerk to do the recording and we employ a minister as an enlistment officer, and sometimes hire an evangelist to help him if he complains that he ought not to do it all by himself. Our laymen need to be shaken up and made to see that to be a passive member defeats the very objects of one's joining the Church. There are good people who actually persuade themselves that they can remain members of 'the dear old church' after they have moved away from it. What must church membership mean to such a man? It is a superstition, pure and simple, a rabbit-foot to keep the booger from catching him till he is safe in heaven."

"The Sunday School is just now presenting problems of the first magnitude in the organized adult department which has grown up so suddenly and which is trying to find itself. It has large possibilities for developing our laymen and relating them more vitally to the Church, but in some instances it seems to have been allowed to have almost the opposite effect. In some places these classes have been increased in a few months from a score to several hundred men. They cease to be groups for Bible study and become congregations for inspirational religious exercises conducted on lines so similar to the preaching service as practically to duplicate it. As one meeting follows the other immediately, and as the two together cover rather too long a time to be devoted to one form of activity, the result is that the second service loses the majority of the men who attend the first. Gradually, without anybody attending it or even anticipating it, they will be thought of more and more as two distinct groups; and then come the little rivalries and then the clashing of interests and the movement becomes a disorganizing force in the Church. Sometimes its whole name—Or-

ganized Adult Department—becomes singularly inappropriate. Its organization has reference only to increasing its size, swelling the list of passive adherents, thus increasing rather than meeting the need for organization; in the second place the Mellin's food diet which they have, and the fact that they wish merely to be fed and not to be led, is not very suggestive of adults; and sometimes there is little propriety in calling it a department of anything, as it is a law unto itself. The pastors who are laying hold of this great movement and turning it towards aggressive work for the Kingdom, are helping to solve the problem of how to give the layman a vital relation to his church."

"The Long Road to Freedom of Worship," by Dr. W. W. Everett, in *The Review and Expositor* (Oct. 1916), alludes to Thos. More and Luther as follows:

"But the Reformers were no better and no worse than Thomas More for they betrayed the liberty which they had at first defended. What nobler defense can be found than in the words of Luther? In the preface to the edition of the Letters of John Huss he says: 'The Papists burned the heretics because they were not able to answer their writings. If killing is confuting then the hangman is the best theologian.' Heresy is a spiritual thing, he said, which no iron can hew down, no fire can burn and no water can drown. One of Luther's Ninety-five Theses read, 'The burning of heretics is against the will of the Holy Spirit.' In 1520 he addressed Christian nobles with these words, 'We should conquer heretics with writings not with fire.' Two years later he exclaimed, 'I will preach, talk and write, but I will not violently force and compel any one, for faith is willing and unconstrained and must be received without compulsion.' In 1523, he demanded: 'What does the Elector count in religious matters? Why do we inquire of him? He has the say only in secular affairs. If he wished to take more we would say, Dear Sir, attend to your own department.' In 1524 he wrote, 'There must be sects. Let the minds of men clash together. If some are misled, that's the way in war. Some must fall wounded, but he who fights

honestly will be crowned. Let everyone teach and believe what he will, the truth or a lie; all the government can do is to prevent incitement to war and riot.' 'If you bid me believe and forbid me to read books, I will not obey. For then you are a tyrant and strike too high, commanding where you have neither right nor power. God's word must fight with heresy. If that fails secular power will fail even if it fills the world with blood.' As late as 1527, he wrote, 'It is not right and it is really grievous to me that the miserable Anabaptists are murdered and burned to death. Everyone should be allowed to believe what he will. Oppose them with writing and the word of God.' Luther remembered that he and his books had been condemned by the Diet of Worms to the flames."

In an article on "Archaeology and Biblical Research" in the *Methodist Review* (Nov. 1916), the following remarks are made concerning the language of the New Testament:

The recently discovered papyri and ostraca have shown conclusively that there is no justification for the old belief that the New Testament was written in a language peculiarly its own. On the other hand, the language is precisely the same as that spoken and written by the common people of the Mediterranean basin in the imperial age. It was the non-literary Greek, not the Greek of Plato and Demosthenes, but rather that of the working man, the traveler, and business life of the period.

Christ, no doubt, spoke Aramaic, and possibly Greek. The same will be true of the apostles. The New Testament—Matthew's Gospel excepted—was written in colloquial Greek or the language understood by the common people all along the Mediterranean coast. As Christianity was to be a world religion, it was necessary that the most cosmopolitan language of the age should be used in promulgating the new religion.

It has been aptly said that the New Testament is the best monument of late colloquial Greek. This greatest of all books makes no effort after elegance of diction or even

conformity to grammar and the canons of literature. This non-literary style, this colloquial Greek, the language of the shops and market-places, of the peasant and the fisherman, must have been the best adapted for the preaching of the gospel in the various great centers.

The learned expositors of the New Testament of the last century, misled by the grammarians and lexicographers, were fond of labeling a very large number of words as "biblical" or "peculiar to the New Testament and Apocrypha." There were at one time no fewer than 500 to 600 such words. Of these more than one hundred have been found in late classical Greek, and a still greater number on the papyri and ostraca of recent finds. So today, instead of five hundred or more "biblical or New Testament words" the number has been reduced to fifty or less. No doubt further investigation will reduce the number still more.

In the *Reformed Church Review* (Oct. 1916) Professor H. M. J. Klein discusses the "Reformation in Relation to the Modern Age." He traces the Reformation to the profound religious experience of Luther.

The proclamation of the experience of Luther of the direct contact of man's personality with God's personality was the foundation of the Reformation. From this idea of faith everything else followed as a corollary. If the sum of religion consisted in trust of the heart in God who had given himself to us in Christ as our Father, then there was swept away the whole idea of the mediation of the priesthood as essential to salvation. It was this mediatorial priesthood that enslaved Europe, that made the liberty of the Christian soul impossible, and that had stood for centuries as a barrier between the soul and its God. When the Reformers proclaimed the priesthood of all believers, they practically issued a religious Magna Charta. Luther's pamphlet on "Christian Liberty" is essentially a declaration of independence. Among other things he said that a Christian man is the most free man of all, subject to none. This reformation doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers was exceedingly far-

reaching in its effects, because it rejected once for all the artificial distinction between clergy and laity which had characterized the religious life of the Middle Ages. The Protestant principle is that laity and clergy alike have direct access to God through faith. As Luther puts it, "All men are worthy to appear before God, to pray for others, to teach each other the things that are of God." In the springtime of the Reformation, under the breath of this principle, everything that had a right freely to assert itself began to struggle forth into independent development. While the early Reformers had no other aim than to restore to the world a living faith in God, yet when they broke away from the shackles of Mediaevalism, the spirit of freedom was felt and vindicated in every sphere of life and the Christian man was made to feel that through his God he was an independent being who stood as a priest before God and as a king before the world.

In the same Review, Dr. Herman writes of "Prayer and Natural Law."

In the final analysis prayer is both possible and natural because God is a Person. Dr. Herman speaks as follows:

Hence the facts, mechanical and vital, not simply warrant but fairly compel the candid searcher of truth to assume that the final cause of the universe is a Person adequate to achieve the astonishing results which have been produced by means of the efficient causes known to us as natural laws—one whose ultimate purpose must be measured by his highest achievement, which is manhood as manifested by Jesus Christ. It is wholly unimportant to inquire what natural science has to say to this form of finalism, for as we have seen, final causes lie beyond the proper sphere of science. Yet it is interesting to observe that great scientists have not only abandoned the irrational materialism of the past generation but are no longer afraid or ashamed of a rational finalism. Long ago, Prof. Agassiz said: "I never make preparation for penetrating into some province of nature hitherto undiscovered without breathing a prayer to the Being who

hides His secrets from me only to allure me cautiously on to the unfolding of them." And more recently, in a presidential address before the British Association, Lord Salisbury said: "Overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie around us; and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living things depend on the One Everlasting Creator and Ruler." Such significant testimonies might be multiplied indefinitely.

"The Effect of the War on Christian Reunion" is the subject of an article by William J. H. Peter in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Oct. 1916). He considers the attitude of the Roman Church to be hostile to any real union of Christendom. While it has modified some of its rigid practices and requirements in minor matters, two facts must be remembered: (1) No Roman doctrine of Trent has been denied. The instances which have occurred are omissions or evasions, for a purpose and for a time. (2) They occur in books intended for Protestants and are given grudgingly, and are merely adaptations to the Protestant state of mind, and knowledge, and reason..... It is vain to look to Rome as she is at present for any contribution to this problem of Christian unity. The war has done little, so far as Rome is concerned, except to reveal her weakness and powerlessness, and to hold up to ridicule her arrogant pretensions, her edicts and decrees.

Gettysburg, Pa.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, PH.D.

In the countless distresses that war has heaped upon the Germans they have turned for comfort and encouragement to their national heroes of all times. Martin Luther, in particular, has received more than usual attention in the popular religious prints during these dark years of untold suffering and sacrifice.

Luther's inspiring battle-hymn of the Reformation, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott," is sung more often by the German soldiers, both Protestant and Catholic, than any other hymn. The preaching of the times abounds in references to Luther and in quotations from his works. Under the influence of the martial spirit of the day men delight to contemplate Luther's strong German consciousness, his dauntless courage in the face of grave danger, his unswerving loyalty to his cause, his heroic efforts against foreign domination in Germany, and his unceasing warfare against tyranny and wrong.

Luther's devotional writings are used in the personal devotions of the men at the front and in the consolations of the wounded and dying. Luther's reasoning about war is applied to the troubled conscience of many a soldier who has knowingly killed some of his fellowmen.

The emergencies of an unprecedented war, even more than the preparations for the quadricentennial celebration of the Reformation, have reminded the Germans of their rich heritage in Martin Luther and have converted the sixteenth century Reformer into a twentieth century Prophet of the German people. The names of the two great Germans are once more united, Luther as the savior of the Germans, and Bismarck as the savior of Germany.

This return of the popular mind to Luther has reflected itself abundantly in the religious press. One writer presents a series of articles on "The German Sword Consecrated by Luther." Another writes on "Lutherus Consolator" and by a narrative of his own personal experi-

ences among the wounded and dying shows how Luther's words and ideas can be applied to the spiritual needs of distressed souls and tender consciences. One paper presents a series of articles embodying lengthy excerpts from Luther's booklet of 1526, "Can a Soldier be a Christian?"

It is interesting to note how thoroughly Luther in his day discussed the many questions pertaining to war. He touched on some of the questions already in his writing of 1523, "Concerning the secular government, to what extent a person owes it obedience." Then the outbreak of the Peasants' War in 1525 compelled him to take a position and to set forth his views in energetic and unmistakable terms. First he expresses his ideas in his "Warning to Peace." Then he sends forth his severe pamphlet, "Against the murderous and rapacious gangs of peasants," which has been so roundly criticized in various quarters, and which he tried to justify in his "Letter concerning the severe little book against the peasants." But the most complete and thorough discussion of the questions pertaining to war he presents in the book of 1526 already mentioned, "Can a Soldier be a Christian?" Finally in 1529, when Germany was threatened with a war with the Turks, the Reformer raised his voice once more on this subject and published two writings entitled, "Concerning the war against the Turks," and "Military Sermon Against the Turks." Not only in the political events of his day but also in the quietistic views of the Anabaptists, the Bohemian Brethren, and other radical reformers, Luther had ample occasion to express his views on various aspects of war. And there is abundant evidence concerning his views on the subject, though it is not easy to gather his views into systematic form.

Julius Richter publishes a very illuminating series of three long articles on "Luther's Attitude Towards War." These articles are the more interesting and instructive because they were written several months before the outbreak of the present war and are therefore free from the prejudice and one-sidedness that naturally color the articles written under the storm and stress of war itself.

One of the writers even undertakes to set forth "Luther's Attitude towards the Turks." In view of Germany's alliance today with Turkey such a subject requires specially delicate treatment. And such it receives. The article shows that Luther's attitude towards the enemies of the Fatherland was one of consistent and abiding antagonism irrespective of the religious situation and the confessional struggles within the Empire. The moral of the article seems to be that ecclesiastical politics and theological controversy should never be permitted to divert attention from a united defense against the foes of country and king.

The war among the nations has raised many problems of practical religious import. The Germans take delight in turning to Luther for light upon their practical problems. The Reformer is made to speak on the most diverse topics and his reasoning is applied to the most modern questions. And thanks to the astounding versatility of the man, his varied activities and his voluminous writings, the sixteenth century prophet has many a practical word to say to the warring Christian nations of the twentieth century.

The most noteworthy instance of this modern appeal to Luther is to be found in a series of seven articles from the pen of Professor Wilhelm Walther of Rostock. Professor Walther is recognized as the foremost living Luther scholar, the one most thoroughly acquainted with Luther's spirit and letter. The whole series of articles is entitled, "The Present War and Doctor Luther." Luther is made to speak in clear terms on the following subjects: Is War Justifiable?, War that is Just, The Assurance of Victory, Sacrifice in Times of War, Righteous Indignation, Prayer in War Times, and War that is Sinful. Let it suffice to consider here Luther's answer to the question whether war is ever justifiable in the eyes of a Christian.

When we ponder the untold sorrows and the innumerable sufferings that follow in the wake of war, when we pause to consider that these warring Christian nations have the express command of their Lord to "love one an-

other," it is impossible to avoid the question whether any Christian can with a clear conscience take part in such terrible procedures, and whether it is not the duty of every Christian to maintain peace at any price. Luther in his day felt the force of such questions and he answered them in unmistakable tones.

The right must be maintained. The Lord loves the right (Psalm 37: 28). And where righteousness and justice are imperilled it is the sacred duty of the individual to fight for the right, and that, too, without regard to his own advantage or disadvantage. But the question arises, *why* does the Lord love the right and what is the ultimate ground on which the individual must fight for the right? Is there not a higher ground than abstract righteousness, a higher motive to justify the struggle for the right and to determine and define that struggle? Luther answers in the affirmative.

The ultimate ground of right and the highest motive for righteous zeal Luther finds in love. The numerous individual precepts of Holy Writ are to be understood simply as examples and incidents of the one supreme command of love. "All that God commands and desires is love." "All the works of the law are enjoined, not merely in order that they themselves may be done, but in order that man may manifest the love that is in his heart." What is contrary to love is contrary to God's will, even though it may seem to be in accord with God's Word. What love demands is in accord with God's will, even though it may seem to be contrary to the words of the Bible. And when love demands that a man fight for the right, it becomes his sacred duty so to fight. Only when Christian love is the impelling motive can a man's fight for the right be called a Christian fight. No Christian can regard any war as justifiable unless it is understood to be a duty imposed by love. But when so understood it is not only justifiable, it is a sacred duty.

Here are Luther's own words for it: "What else is war than the punishment of wrong and evil? Why does a person go to war except to secure peace and obedience. Although it may not appear to the superficial view that

killing and robbing is a work of love appropriate to Christian hands, nevertheless in reality it is a work of love. For example, a good physician may find a disease so virulent and widespread that he must cut off a hand, a foot, an ear, or an eye, in order to save the whole body. If one should regard only the member that is cut off, the physician might seem to be an atrocious, merciless man. But if one regards the body that he has saved, it is clear that the physician is a true and faithful man and has performed a good Christian deed. Likewise, if I think of war, how it punishes the wicked, kills the unjust, and causes all manner of misery, I may be disposed to regard it as a most unchristian work and quite contrary to Christian love. But if I consider how it protects the good, preserves and defends wife and child, house and home, goods and honor and peace, then I see how precious and divine a work it is and I observe that it is nothing more than the amputation of a leg or a hand in order that the entire body may not be destroyed. For if the sword did not defend us and preserve the peace everything in the world would be lost in turmoil. Therefore we may say that war is nothing but a short lapse of the peace which preserves us against eternal and endless turmoil, nothing but a small misfortune which spares us the necessity of an infinitely greater misfortune."

It is greatly to be regretted, says Luther, that such terrible measures as war involves cannot be avoided. But it grows out of the deep sinfulness of the human race.

Luther's idea then, is that war is a necessary evil, a sharp instrument wielded by a hand of love in order to preserve the human race against the much greater evil of complete bondage to the powers of wickedness. But such a justification of war may seem too weak to apply to such a cataclysm as that which at present convulses the world involving as it does the whole world's population and entailing horrors and miseries that cannot be conceived by the liveliest imagination. Nevertheless, Luther insists that his logic applies to war no matter how great the number of persons involved. The larger the number of those who oppose the right, the greater is the amount of

the evil that they will accomplish unless they are prevented by force. "If a thief or a murderer or an adulterer is punished, that is the punishment of a single evildoer. But if a person goes to war for the sake of the right, i. e., under the dictates of love, he helps to punish at one stroke a whole big mass of evildoers and thus helps to punish a so much greater offense against the right."

But Luther's analogy between the individual criminal and the masses in the army of the warring enemy does not hold in all particulars. The punishment, even the capital punishment, of the individual criminal we may regard with equanimity because we feel that he has received his individual deserts. But the terrible thing about war is that suffering and death are here visited upon multitudes of individuals who are personally innocent, multitudes of innocent in the army that is opposing the right and multitudes of innocent in the army that is defending the right. How are we to justify the operations of an instrument that lacerates and amputates not only the offending members of the human organism, but also the innocent and wholesome members? Luther perceived the difficulty and he met it.

In a sermon on Abraham's forcible rescue of Lot from the hands of the hostile kings Luther points out that we are all involved in a social organism from whose fortunes we cannot as individuals separate ourselves. We are involved in a community, innocent with guilty, just with unjust. We must share the misfortunes, even as we are privileged to share the fortunes, of those among whom our lot is cast. This is true of pestilence and plague, of famine and plenty, of adversity and prosperity, and it is true of war and peace. The wielding of the sword is not the only agency that brings agony and death upon innocent husbands and fathers and heaps woe and misery upon innocent widows and orphans. Even in the punishment of the individual criminal under civil law many of his innocent fellowmen may suffer. God has so ordered the universe and the human race that we are not only individuals but also parts of a complex whole. That is

why the sword of war strikes not only the originator of the war but the whole people. The amputation of a diseased member of the body may draw blood from the healthy members and even entail pain and weakness upon the whole body. It is part of the divine order and will.

Luther never lost sight of the fact that war is an evil and therefore wrong. It grows out of the perversity of human nature and the sinfulness of men. But God in his providence overrules it to His own glory. He turns the counsels of kings to His purposes, and the ragings of the nations He maketh to praise Him. In the face of actual war, therefore, we must learn to keep quiet and to bow submissively before the fact that God's hand is upon us. In a two-fold sense Luther saw God's will and hand in war. First, it is one of the means He employs to maintain righteousness among the nations. Second, it is one of the means He employs to visit discipline upon sinful humanity. With reference to the first, we must serve Him by drawing the sword. With reference to the second, it is our religious duty humbly to bear the terrible consequences of war.

Treitschke once ascribed to Luther a certain "idealism of war." Such an idealism, in the sense in which Moltke and Treitschke himself advocated it, cannot be found in Luther's thought or expression. The idea of these modern Germans is that war is good and useful to develop the noblest virtues of man. Moltke wrote that war is useful because it cultivates the qualities of "courage and self-denial, loyalty to duty and willingness to sacrifice"; and he maintained that "without wars the world would be completely lost in materialism and would become a veritable wilderness so far as morals are concerned." Luther's idea of war was somewhat different. It is true Luther spoke of war as "an element in God's plan for the universe." But in the foreground of Luther's reasoning on the subject always stood the idea that war is a necessary evil, a matter of discipline and woe (*Plage*). Nowhere does he say that war ennobles the warrior or advances the race. It is nothing but a bitter and inexorable necessity which the Christian must view

"with manly eyes." There is such a thing as a righteous war on the part of a whole nation. And when an individual finds himself involved in war, whether his country is right or wrong, his duty to his neighbor demands that he should enter the conflict with a good conscience, should "commend his body and soul into God's hands, draw his sword and strike in God's name."

These and a great many other things Luther said about the justification of war. It does not seem to have occurred to him to raise the question whether war might not be entirely prevented or abolished. Luther recognizes war as a terrible evil, but he does not come upon the thought that the world might get along very well without it. Christ's ethical precept, "Resist not evil," Luther binds very firmly upon the consciences of individual Christians. But he never goes on to apply the principles to the world as a whole with its struggles and its wars. It is clear that the great Reformer, despite the grand heights to which he often attained even on very practical subjects, nevertheless in his views on war was for the most part under the influence of the Augustianian and the mediaeval view of the world.

Gettysburg, Pa.

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA.

The Formula of Concord, Its Origin and Contents. A Contribution to Symbolics by George J. Fritschel, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Church History at Wartburg Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa. Cloth. Pp. xii. 228 Price \$1.25.

Dr. Fritschel has treated his subject with scholarly thoroughness. He prepares the way to the consideration of the Formula itself by presenting first the Historical Origin of the Formula. Beginning with the status of Lutheran Germany after Luther's death, he traces the political, ecclesiastical and doctrinal conflicts which were waged for a third of a century. With historical fidelity he follows the several controversies, the final settlement of which is so ably expressed in the Formula. The historical setting of the Formula constitutes not only Part I, but is presented also in Part II, "The Formula of Concord Itself," in the historical introduction to each article. Nothing is left unsaid to explain and to clarify the occasion of its existence. This historical presentation and vindication of the Formula seems to be somewhat out of proportion to the discussion of the Formula itself.

The Formula is analyzed in the form of an outline giving the pros and cons in an intelligible way.

We commend Dr. Fritschel's book as an excellent introduction to the study of the Formula, one of the richest of the symbols of the Lutheran Church.

The Publication Society has issued the work in an attractive form.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Luther's Christmas Tree, by Theophilus Stork, D.D., with Illustrations, reprinted after the original edition of 1855. Illuminated paper cover. Pp. 32. Price 10 cents.

This is a beautifully printed and well told Child's Life of Luther. The late Dr. Stork was a gifted writer, and in Luther's Christmas Tree he makes Luther live again. In this Reformation year, when we celebrate the 400th Anniversary of the Reformation thousands of copies of

the "Christmas Tree" should be circulated. The life of Luther shows us how the peasant lived long ago, and how he struggled for an education and for the light and comfort of the Gospel. His experiences have been blessed of God to be a help to thousands. A new era of Luther's usefulness is opening at this time.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Challenge of the Sunday School. By Charles P. Wiles, D.D. Pp. 185. Price \$1.00 net.

The author of this volume is well and most favorably known throughout the General Synod as the editor of our Publication Society and especially of our Sunday School literature. About a year ago he visited the theological seminaries of the General Synod by appointment of the Board of Publication and delivered in each a series of lectures on the history, development and work of the Sunday School. These lectures have been revised and enlarged and are now given to the public in this excellent volume. Dr. Wiles has done well to publish them. His book makes a valuable addition to our Sunday School literature. It is especially valuable because it comes from a Lutheran source and is thoroughly Lutheran in its teaching.

The volume is divided into five principal parts: The History of the Sunday School; The Place of the Sunday School; The Importance of the Sunday School; The Aim of the Sunday School; and The Efficiency of the Sunday School. This furnishes a comprehensive survey of the whole subject, and it would be difficult to raise any important question that is not adequately discussed.

The author shows remarkable restraint and balance, also, in the discussion of his subject. Most writers as experts on subjects to which they have given much time and study, and in which they have become deeply interested, lose all sense of proportion. They make extravagant claims for their particular line of work, and try to push everything else into the background. There is nothing of this in Dr. Wiles' book. He, of course, stresses the importance of the Sunday School in the work of the Church, and especially in the nurture of the youth of the Church. But he makes no undue claims for it, neither does he belittle any other legitimate work by contrast. Especially does he recognize the place and importance of the Church itself, and of its regular services, as the divinely appointed means for the salvation of men, and for

the training of them in Christian truth and in righteousness.

Dr. Wiles deserves praise also for his loyalty to the Lutheran faith and cultus. There is of course no bigotry. No one who knows Dr. Wiles would suspect him of this. But always he writes as a Lutheran for Lutherans. This may somewhat restrict the sale of the book, but it makes it all the more valuable for Lutherans. Many books on the Sunday School and on Sunday School work are written from a standpoint that is positively hostile to our Lutheran conception of the Christian nurture of children, or are so colorless on this subject, that they are either useless to our people, or actually misleading and injurious. It is good, therefore, to pick up a book like this which is written frankly and distinctly from the Lutheran standpoint. We have in mind especially those parts of the book which treat of the attitude that should be taken by the Sunday School towards the baptized children of the Church.

No pains have been spared by the Publication House in the mechanical work on this volume. The paper, the type and the press work are all of the very best, and the binding is well done in a strong and artistic cover. The book should have a large sale. It should be read by every pastor and Sunday School superintendent, and especially by every Sunday School teacher in the Lutheran Church.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

GENERAL COUNCIL PUBLICATION HOUSE. PHILADELPHIA.

Life of Adolph Spaeth, D.D., LL.D., 1839-1910. Told in his own Reminiscences, his Letters and the Recollection of his Family and Friends. Edited by his wife. Sixteen Illustrations. Cloth. Pp. 439.

The biography of the late Dr. Spaeth is a most interesting and well-told life story of one of the most noted and most gifted of our Lutheran clergy. It is a charming book in contents and composition, well worth perusal by all who admire a man of strong personality. Dr. Spaeth came to America from Europe toward the close of the Civil War in 1864, and became an ardent American, who however never lost his love for the Fatherland. He was cosmopolitan in his experiences. Born in Germany, he spent a year in Italy and two in Scotland before coming to America. He was educated in one of the so-called lower seminaries of Wuertemberg and the University of Tübingen. He was a man of the greatest versatility—poet, musician, author, professor and

preacher. His industry was indefatigable. The churches which he served in Philadelphia, the Lutheran Seminary in which he was for many years professor, and the Deaconess House and Mary J. Drexel Home with which he was so closely identified from their foundation—all bear the marks of his counsels and labors.

His domestic relations were most lovely. He came from a good family, all whose members were people of fine character and unusual ability. He was twice happily married. His first wife was a daughter of Dr. John Duncan, a distinguished Scotch Presbyterian minister; and his second wife, the daughter of the late Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, the first Dean of the Lutheran Seminary in Philadelphia.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. BOSTON, MASS.

Bible Stories to Read and Tell, with References to the Old and New Testaments. Selected and Arranged by Frances Jenkins Olcott. Illustrations by Willy Pogany. Cloth. Illuminated Cover. Pp. 486. Price \$2.00 net.

These stories from the Old Testament in the language of the King James version are not intended as substitutes for the Bible itself, but rather as an incentive to its perusal. Here and there a word is omitted or that from another version is substituted in the interest of clearness, but these changes in no sense mar the beauty and majesty of the old version. A celebrated Hungarian artist has furnished the illustrations, which are printed in colors. The value of such a book is very great. It will be welcomed by parents as a gift book for the older children and as a book from which to read to the younger. Faithfully used it will minister to religion and to culture. In later years many who have heard or read these stories will rise and call their parents blessed for the enjoyment, the information and the inspiration which enriched their youthful minds.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Challenge of the Future, A Study in American Foreign Policy, by Roland G. Usher, Ph.D., Professor of History in Washington University, St. Louis, Author of "Pan-Germanism," "Pan-Americanism," etc., etc. Cloth. Pp. 350. Price \$1.75 net.

This book deals with the great problems pertaining to the future of the United States. Its statements and

prognostications are somewhat disquieting to those of us who have comforted ourselves with the idea that our country has nothing worse to fear than its politicians. Perhaps after all they are the chief source of danger in not properly estimating our present and future relations to the other great world-powers.

The author shows that the present European war is simply a phase of a natural and inevitable economic struggle. He does not believe that war can ever in the long run change the workings of the great fundamental law of supply and demand. The war of the American Revolution and that of 1812 were really only nominal victories for the United States for they left us poorer in trade and in the power of commanding foreign markets than before.

The period of American isolation is at an end. If America would have ought to say in the decisions of international questions, it must have an intelligent comprehension of them and of the compromises which are involved, and must have the physical ability to sustain its opinions. We have few trained diplomats and all of them are subject to the political whims of the dominant party. Our army and navy are out of all proportion to our needs and utterly inadequate to cope with any one of the several foreign nations.

We cannot, even if we would, preserve isolation. We are not independent in the true sense of the word. We are a debtor nation. In spite of recent changes, the United States still owes billions of dollars to foreign investors. Our inability, after the war, to maintain our present temporary commercial supremacy, must be patent to all who know the capacity of Germany and England to undersell us in the markets of the world. This means inability to earn dividends on foreign capital, loss of trade, with incident poverty and attendant evils.

The United States, our author believes, can not be subjugated by a foreign power, but may readily be invaded by England Germany or Japan, and made to pay a frightful levy. This is not only a possibility, but under certain contingencies may become actual. The only remedy for such a contingency lies in giving up all pretensions to regulate the course of economic progress in other lands, or to ally ourselves with a superior power or to do both. Should we seek, for instance, to check the economic expansion of Japan in Korea or China, our protests would go for naught unless we could enforce them by power of arms. This we are not prepared to do. Any attempt to do this at present would mean the loss of

the Philippines. The second alternative—to form an alliance with a great power—is the only feasible solution. The author thinks that only by forming an alliance with Great Britain can the United States preserve its present status. This opinion is not based on prejudices against Germany, but on the fact that England is and for some time will continue to be mistress of the sea. We must give up the Monroe Doctrine as far as it applies to South America. We must apply it rigidly to the regions adjacent to and north of the Panama Canal, which we must protect at all hazards. We must police Central America and Mexico, and bring them into harmony with our American ideals and finally absorb them. We must concede the control of the Atlantic to the British and that of the Pacific to the Japanese.

All this involves a measure of military preparedness far beyond our present condition. A thoroughly equipped and drilled standing army of about half a million soldiers and a navy of at least double its present size will be necessary. Technical knowledge and skill must be demanded, graft abated, and leadership developed. These things require much time and patience, and therefore not a day should be lost in securing experts to map out and begin systematic work. Civilians should not be permitted to head the great departments upon whose efficiency our future must largely depend.

Such in brief is the program outlined by a thorough student of the present world situation. It will be well for us to ponder what he has submitted.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Mythology of All Races, in Thirteen Volumes, Louis Herbert Gray, A.M., Ph.D., editor, George Toot Moore, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor. *Oceanic*, by Roland B. Dixon, Ph.D., Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University. Volume ix. Cloth. Pp. xv. 364. Illustrated.

The present volume is the third of the series to appear. It sustains the high character of its predecessors as reviewed in a previous issue of the QUARTERLY. The myths and tales in this volume have been gathered from all parts of Oceanica, embracing all island areas, great or small, from the Easter Island to Sumatra, and from Hawaii to New Zealand. This great region is subdivided by the author into five sections: Polynesia, Melanesia, Indonesia, Micronesia, and Australia with Tasmania. The natural features of this area are hardly more diver-

sified than the characteristics of the inhabitants. The volume before us presents not only the more important types of myths but calls attention also to the resemblances and similarities existing between the myth-incidents of one area and another. There is no attempt however, at rationalizing these myths, or explaining that one is lunar and another solar. The author is very reserved in his conclusions, holding that in the present state of knowledge dogmatism is not allowable.

We find the ancient world-wide myths concerning the creation and the deluge, and also unmistakable traces of the Grecian mythology. There are numerous folk-lore tales and trickster tales resembling the Br'er Rabbit stories of the negro. All these make interesting reading and reveal characteristics common to all races.

The more philosophical myths concerning the origin of the world and man point to some original source whence they emanated and were modified as they were borne here and there by tides of emigration. Whether the Hebrew prophets drew from the original sources or purified ancient traditions is immaterial; but it is certain that their cosmogony is infinitely superior to that of all other races.

These volumes on Mythology constitute a unique and valuable addition to any library.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

WARTBURG PRESS. WAVERLY, IOWA.

R. F. Weidner, D.D., LL.D. A Character Sketch, An Appreciation, A Tribute. By G. H. Gerberding, D.D., LL.D. Paper. Pp. 141. Illustrated.

This is a beautifully printed and well illustrated booklet, commemorating the life, character and services of the late President of the Chicago Theological Seminary. In the estimate of his friend and co-laborer, Dr. Weidner had all the elements of true greatness. His native ability, enthusiasm, industry and scholarship fitted him for his task as administrator, teacher and author. Though a man of fine physique, his ambition exceeded his physical endurance, causing a serious break-down at the age of fifty-four. After about ten years of brave resistance in continued labor he finally succumbed. His monument is in the hearts of his pupils; his memorial in the Seminary at Maywood.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE ABINGDON PRESS. 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK CITY.

The Man of Power: A Series of Studies in Christian Efficiency. By Lynn Harold Hough. 16mo. Pp. 140. Price 75 cents net.

Professor Hough is getting quite a list of books to his credit. Among those preceding this one are "The Men of the Gospels," "The Lure of Books," "Athanasius: the Hero," "The Theology of a Preacher," "The Quest for Wonder," and "The Valley of Decision."

Most of these are small books like the one now under review. But they are all worth-while books. They are all well written, in a strong and vivid style that grips the reader and holds his interest and his attention from beginning to end. They are not only interesting, but they are helpful. They leave the reader with a firmer hold on the truth and stimulate to a living faith and an earnest life.

In this volume on "The Man of Power," the discussion revolves around the much used, and sometimes much abused, word "efficiency." There are twelve chapters and each one presents some phase of efficiency. We have, for example, "Inner Efficiency," "Efficiency in Expression," "The Efficient Mind," "The Efficient Conscience," "Emotional Efficiency," "The Efficient Will," &c. Two of the most striking chapters are on "The Efficient Churchman," and "The Efficient Citizen." The final chapter is on "Complete Efficiency." It is full of stimulating thought set forth in a very striking and stimulating way.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Modern Messages from Great Hymns. By Robert Elmer Smith. Introduction by Bishop James W. Bashford. 12mo. (5½ x 8). Pp. 283. Binding, cloth with gilt top. Price \$1.25 net.

This is one of the most delightful books that have come into our hands for a long time both in its contents and in its make-up. It is a splendid specimen of the book-maker's art. The paper is of the best quality, the type is large and clear, the press work is perfect, and the binding exquisite. We cannot help wondering how, with the present high price of paper and labor, such a book can be put out to be sold for \$1.25.

But of course, as with every really good book, the chief value of this one is found in its contents. Twelve of the

finest, as well as best known and most loved hymns in the English language are taken up for discussion in a very interesting and suggestive way. We must give the list. It is like a brilliant constellation made up of glowing stars, every one of them of the first magnitude. Just note them: "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," by Charles Wesley; "Stand Up, Stand Up for Jesus," by George Duffield, Jr.; "Some Day the Silver Cord Will Break," by Fanny Crosby; "God Moves in a Mysterious Way," by William Cowper; "Nearer My God to Thee," by Sarah F. Adams; "Majestic Sweetness Sits Enthroned," by Samuel Stennett; "Faith of Our Fathers," by Frederick W. Faber; "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty," by Reginald Heber; "Rock of Ages, Cleft for Me," by Augustus M. Toplady; "Lead Kindly Light," by John Henry Newman; "Onward, Christian Soldiers," by Sabine Baring-Gould; "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name," by Edward Perronet. It would not be easy to pick out another such a dozen hymns as this.

We suspect that the "Messages" from these hymns were originally delivered as sermons, or perhaps Sunday evening addresses. If this were the case it detracts nothing from their interest or value. Rather does it enhance them. At any rate the human touch is strong in them, and the human interest deep and keen. It might be said that these hymns do not need interpretation. They carry their messages on the surface and no one can miss them. Certainly, they have brought comfort, and help, and strength to multitudes of God's children, and they have been to other multitudes the vehicles for the expression of their deepest emotions and their loftiest aspirations. But, at the same time, we are persuaded that the reading of this volume will make them both more meaningful and more helpful.

The author shows a deep insight in his interpretation of the hymns, and also a rare knowledge of human nature in his illustration and enforcement of their "messages." We are not surprised at the testimony which Bishop Bashford quotes from the lips of Fanny Crosby. He says that when Dr. Smith's "Message" from her hymn, "Some Day the Silver Cord Will Break," was read to her, her face lighted up and she exclaimed: "Mr. Smith has expressed the very thoughts I had in mind, and I am glad I have a kindred spirit. You can read my inmost thoughts in his unfolding of my hymn." Neither are we surprised at this testimony from one who heard at least some of the "Messages" delivered: "By a simple and clear style, a copious store of illustration, and, above

all, a vision of the Master's face in every Message, he causes these jewels of the Church catholic to shine with a new luster."

We commend this volume to all for private devotional reading. We especially commend it to pastors for reading and study. It will furnish them with a great deal of very rich and suggestive illustrative material, and may suggest a similar treatment of other hymns for pulpit use, which might prove most acceptable and profitable to their hearers.

It should be added that each hymn is illustrated with a fine full-page engraving.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

The Undiscovered Country, Studies in the Christian Doctrine of an Intermediate State between Death and the Consummation of the World. By George W. Osmund, Ph.D. Cloth. Pp. 339. Price \$1.25 net.

The persistence of Personality beyond the grave is well nigh a universal belief, taught in Scripture and in harmony with the teachings of science. That the soul will inevitably go to its "own place" can not be doubted. The nature of that place and the stages by which it is reached can be determined only by a careful study of divine revelation. Dr. Osmund has given an intelligent interpretation of biblical teaching, showing that between death and final destiny there is an Intermediate State. He traces the history of the doctrine from the Patristic period to the present, and finds its ground on the "Shadows and Glimmerings" of the Old Testament and more especially in "Christ's Fuller Revelation." The author discusses the Descent of Christ into Hades, but to our mind is not as clear and satisfactory on this point as he is on such questions as consciousness in the other world, probation, and heaven.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Foundations of Christian Belief, Studies in the Philosophy of Religion. By Francis L. Strickland, Professor of Philosophy in the University of West Virginia. Cloth. Pp. 319. Size, crown 8vo. Price \$1.50 net.

The purpose of this volume is the discussion of some fundamental matters in the philosophy of religion, not from the standpoint of abstract speculation but from that of religious values. The treatment is not severely critical but constructive and in harmony with Christi-

anity. The general purpose of the philosophy of religion is the interpretation in a rational and systematic manner of religious experience. The author wastes no time in proving the existence of religion, the evidence of which is so patent. After briefly reviewing the various philosophical systems, and showing the untenability of materialism, agnosticism and pantheism as world-views, he shows that Theism offers the only satisfactory explanation of the world and of its relation to the Infinite Personal Spirit. It is in the idea of Personality that the author finds the basis of religion, and the revelation of God. He demonstrates that the fundamentals of the Christian faith, such as the divinity of Christ, miracles, inspiration, are all defensible on the ground of rational experience. The book is a fine philosophical apologetic of Christianity.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

The Gospel of Good Will as Revealed in Contemporary Scriptures. By William DeWitt Hyde, President of Bowdoin College. Cloth binding. Pp. 245.

This volume contains the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale School of Religion for 1916. We doubt, however, whether they will add much either to the reputation of the author, or to the value of this remarkable series of lectures. Certainly this volume is by no means equal, in our judgment, to either Horne's "The Romance of Preaching," or Pepper's "A Voice from the Crowd," the two immediately preceding.

And yet the book is unique in its way, and has many strong points. The whole conception of the lectures is unique and striking. First, the title is peculiar, "The Gospel of Good Will." The author himself recognizes this and rises to explain in the preface. He asks the question: "Why the Gospel of Good Will? Why not the Gospel of God; the Gospel of Christ; or the Gospel of the Spirit?" His answer is: "Because for many of us God is a far-off, forbidding being; Christ has become sentimental and external; the Spirit has come to stand for something vague and mystical."

A paragraph from the "Introduction" makes his viewpoint clearer, perhaps. He says: "We are passing through a revolution in religious thought. The old terms remain; but with new meanings and new emphasis. The old views had at least the merit of clearness. The

preacher knew precisely what to preach: and the layman knew how to put the preaching into practice. The new views have not yet become equally precise. Not every preacher who holds them knows how to make them clear to his congregation: and not every one in the congregation who hears them preached is quite clear about the manner of life for which they call."

This sounds like a complete departure from the old land-marks, and a surrender of the old faith in God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit. But the lecturer thinks not. He expresses the hope that in the end his hearers, or readers, will "find these personal terms defined and deepened, expanded and enriched." For, he continues, "Good Will is not an impersonal abstraction floating in empty air. It is the fundamental attribute of God; the essential nature of Christ; the characteristic quality of the Spirit: and whoever lives in Good Will thereby becomes a son or daughter of God, a brother or sister of Christ, a disciple and friend of the Spirit." But President Hyde is a pragmatist in philosophy, and a disciple and apostle of the Higher Criticism and the New Theology. He teaches in his last lecture that a man can be obedient to the "Gospel of Good Will," and therefore a Christian, without reading the Bible, or keeping the Sabbath, or going to church to worship, or using the sacraments, or praying, though he believes that all these may be helpful to him if properly used. As he sums it all up in next to the last paragraph, "A man who believes and lives this Gospel [of Good Will] whatever else he may believe or not believe, do or refrain from doing, is a Christian."

Another unique feature of the lectures, as also indicated in the general title, is that the underlying thought of each is taken, not from the Bible or from writers on Homiletics or Theology or Church History, but from contemporary secular literature. Thus the first lecture, on "Christ's Expectation of Men," is based on Jerome K. Jerome's "The Passing of the Third Floor Back," long extracts of which are quoted. The second lecture, on "Falling Short of Goodwill," or "The Meanness of Sin," is based on John Masefield's "The Everlasting Mercy," and "The Widow in the Bye Street." The third lecture, on "Restoration to Good Will: Repentance and Forgiveness," is based on the writings of Thomas Mott Osborne, the famous reformer of Sing Sing Prison. The fourth lecture, on "Good Will in Secular Vocations: Service," is based on a book by John Graham Brooks, "An American Citizen." The fifth one, on "The Cost of Good Will: Sacrifice," is based on "How Belgium Saved Europe," by

Charles Sarolea. The sixth, on "By-Products of Good Will: the Christian Virtues," is based on Kennedy's "The Servant in the House." The seventh, on "Good Will in Society: Reform," is based on two books by Jacob Riis, "The Making of an American," and "The Battle with the Slum." While the eighth and last lecture, on "Fellowship in Good Will: the Church," is based on Winston Churchill's "The Inside of the Cup."

We cannot take the space to show how each of these texts is utilized and applied to the work of preaching, and of practical Christian living. But that there are many very striking and suggestive passages goes without saying. President Hyde is a vigorous thinker and writer, and no thoughtful and wideawake preacher can read this volume without being helped, even though he may not agree with by any means all that he will find there. We have been especially impressed with the sanity and wisdom of the advice given in the lecture on "Good Will in Society: Reform." This is one of the danger points of the present day for the pulpit. Many preachers make shipwreck just here, by being too dogmatic and too partisan. President Hyde says: "There are usually two sides to a social question; and some truth on each side. There are two ways of taking each side: one that is right and one that is wrong. Ordinarily it is not the preacher's business to tell his people which side of a debatable social question they shall take: but to show them how to take whichever side they join in the right and not in the wrong way."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

SHERMAN, FRENCH & COMPANY. BOSTON, MASS.

The Essentials of Religious Education. By Charles William Heathcote, A.M., S.T.D. Pp. 290. Price \$1.50 net.

The author of this volume is a Lutheran minister. He has served churches in Chambersburg and in Philadelphia, Pa. For several years past he has been an instructor in Religious Education in the Theological Department of Temple University, Phila. Dr. Conwell, the President of Temple University, has written a brief introduction to the volume in which he says: "The author is not only a scholar and a skillful instructor; he is a direct benefactor. All books having the purpose combined with clear thinking bring the Bible nearer to the people and waken their desire to know its contents."

In the Preface the author states that the book is the outgrowth of his lectures given in the Temple University, and is published in response to the frequently repeated requests from his students and others interested in religious education. He further states that the volume is intended primarily as a text-book to be used in universities, colleges, and theological seminaries.

The first chapter is devoted to a discussion of "The Scope of Religious Education." This chapter appeared as an article in the October, 1916, number of *THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*. The next four chapters, covering about 100 pages, present the history of religious education beginning with the early Egyptian, Chinese, and Babylonian periods, and coming down to the Raikes movement in England and the development of the modern Sunday, or Bible, School in this country.

The next section discusses the psychological side of the subject in five chapters, covering about 70 pages. There are five chapters in this part treating of "The Principles of Psychology," and the various periods of "Child Development," from early childhood to late adolescence. The remaining eight chapters are devoted to the practical side of the subject, the requisites for teaching, the training required, the organization of the Bible School, and the problems connected with its work and administration.

The author has brought together much interesting and valuable information on these several topics, and has made a useful contribution to a most important subject.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. NEW YORK, CHICAGO AND TORONTO.

The Enchanted Universe; and Other Sermons. By Frederick W. Shannon, Pastor of the Reformed Church-on-the-Heights, Brooklyn, New York. 12mo. Pp. 204. Price \$1.00 net.

Dr. Shannon is one of the best known, and one of the most popular and successful pastors in "the City of Churches." This is his third volume of sermons to be published. As in the case of the two former volumes, it takes its title from the first sermon in the series. There are twelve sermons in all. Some of the other titles are, "The Untroubled Heart," "The Higher Unity," "The One Touch More," "God's Use of Affliction," "The Final Candour," "The Shepherd God," &c.

Dr. Shannon's thought is clear, strong, lofty and inspiring. His style is epigrammatic and forceful. A good example of this is found in the introduction to the tenth sermon, on "The Final Candour." The text is Luke VIII:17, "For nothing is hid, that shall not be made manifest; nor anything secret, that shall not be known and come to light." The sermon opens thus: "This is our Lord's way of saying that we live in a transparent universe. Apparently just the opposite is true. So many curtains of enigma, rustlingly blown by the winds of mystery, tremble before our gaze, that we sometimes despair of discerning clarity, intention, purposefulness in the trend of things. The darkness seems deep and permanent while the light seems superficial and transient. The gloom is steadfast, the gleam is fitful; sin is glaringly triumphant, righteousness is modestly unassertive; disintegrating doubt is obstinate, constructive faith is difficult to practice. Is not this a familiar reading of the world? Unquestionably it is, and it is essentially untrue. For despite the apparent meaninglessness of life, there is a profound, universal, unceasingly active, shaping power that makes for order, for righteousness, for realization of the one increasing purpose which runs from everlasting to everlasting. In a word, Christ says that the principle of self-revelation is ingrained in the universe, in history, in things, in men. All are out on a campaign of ultimate, noon-clear publicity. There is a final candour at the heart of things. The hidden evil and the hidden goodness are alike marching toward manifestation. There can be no permanent secrets in a scheme of things whose genius is detection and publication."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

The Lord God of Elijah. By David Heagle, Ph.D., D.D.
Pp. 68. Price 40 cents net.

The sub-title of this stirring little volume gives a better idea of its aim and contents than the title quoted above. It is "The True Biblical Doctrine of God as Opposed by Evolution." In the preface, or "Foreword," the author explains further that the essay is intended to "defend the exceedingly important doctrine of God's transcendence," and that it was originally prepared as an article for the series of pamphlets published for a time under the general title of "*Fundamentals*."

Dr. Heagle divides his discussion into three parts. In

the first part he treats of "the peculiar nature of Elijah's God," showing that He is a God "who can work miracles," who "can hear and answer prayer," and who "can assist us in all our needs and distresses," and who is therefore "the great transcendent God of the universe"; and also of the modern theories which are opposed to God's transcendence. Among the latter are included "the original doctrine of evolution," the "New Theology," the teaching of "Higher Criticism," the "philosophical notions" of men like John Fiske and Professor Bowne, and the various healing cults and other mysticisms. The second part, which is by far the most extensive, presents the proofs of God's transcendence. A third part deals with certain "corollaries" that follow from the doctrine of divine transcendence, such as that the God of the Bible is "a very different God from the God of all evolutionary theories," and that "evolution is not an authority in matters of religion," and that "the Bible alone can tell us about God and the great hereafter."

The book is well written, and the arguments are presented clearly and strongly. We doubt, however, whether they would be at all convincing for one who doubts or denies the transcendence of God, simply because he would deny or call in question the validity of the premises on which the arguments are based. But they will no doubt strengthen the faith, and help to relieve the fears, of many who may have been disturbed by the assaults of the opposing theories.

The book is beautifully printed and bound.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE ANTI-USURY LEAGUE. MILLERSBURG, OHIO.

Usury: A Scriptural, Ethical and Economic View. By Calvin Elliott. Pp. 300.

This is an interesting book. It is well written. But we fear that it is a case of "love's labor lost." The man who undertakes at this day to prove that not only the taking of usury, in the commonly accepted meaning of that word, but all taking of interest on loans, is unscriptural, unethical, and opposed to a sound economics, has a big task on his hands. Yet, this is the task which the author of this book has set for himself.

In his first chapter, on "Definition," the author quotes Blackstone as saying: "When money is lent on a contract to receive not only the principal sum again, but also an increase by way of compensation for the use, the increase

is called interest by those who think it lawful, and usury by those who do not." Mr. Elliott belongs to the latter class. He absolutely condemns all taking of interest, under any circumstances whatever. Hence he calls it all by the one name "usury."

The argument is based on the law of Moses which forbade the taking of usury, or interest, from any but strangers, on the denunciations of the prophets against the taking of usury, on the teachings of the Master and the practice of His disciples, also on Church history and the teaching of the early Church Fathers. The author claims also that the taking of interest is condemned by a sound ethical principle, by sound economics, and especially by its bad effects on character, both of the lender and the borrower, and by the oppression and enslavement of the poor which it makes not only possible but almost inevitable.

It would probably not be difficult to expose the fallacies in some of the arguments. For example, the fact that the law of Moses permitted the taking of interest from strangers, while forbidding it in transactions between fellow Hebrews, would seem to indicate that it was not regarded as inherently and essentially immoral in itself, but that its prohibition as between Hebrews was a matter of expediency and was a part of the general policy of restraint and restriction which was intended to keep them a separate people. No such distinction was ever recognized in connection with any of the Ten Commandments.

Then, again, the author's interpretation of the parable of the Pounds seems very forced and unnatural. His assumption, also, that the lender is always the favored one in making a loan is utterly untenable. The borrower is more frequently the beneficiary than the lender, and very often if not generally to a much greater extent. Why should he not be willing and be expected to pay something for the benefit? If a man can extend or increase his business and largely increase his profits by borrowing, why should not the lender benefit by this as well as the borrower?

These and many other similar questions arise in the reading of this book. But it is not our intention to attempt a reply to the arguments here. If any one assumes that the radical position taken by the author must of necessity be unsound and his arguments weak, let him read the book through and he will likely be surprised to find how strong a case is made out. He may not be con-

vinced, but he will be forced to think, and to think probably along new lines which had never occurred to him before.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

W. N. HARLEY. COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Little Journeys with Martin Luther. By Brother John, of the Order of Poor Brethren, commonly known as Lutheran Pastors. Cloth bound. Pp. 354. Price \$1.50 postpaid.

The author of this book is a genius. He is a shrewd observer, has been a careful student of the history of the Lutheran Church in this country, has a keen sense of humor, and has developed "the art of putting things" to a high degree of perfection. He seeks to conceal his identity under the pseudonym "Brother John," but we suspect that the real author is the Rev. W. N. Harley, a member of the Joint Synod of Ohio, who publishes the book, and stands sponsor for it in a kind of explanatory preface, or introductory chapter. He states in this that the manuscript of the book came into his possession with a large number of other manuscripts, most of them sermons, as a literary legacy "from the pen of a deceased clergyman."

The scheme of the book is this. The writer represents himself as standing in front of the Luther statue in Washington one Lord's day evening in the middle of June in 1898. He was thinking of the great things that Luther had done, and of the mighty changes that had taken place since Luther's day. He then fell to wondering what Luther would think and say if he could come back to earth again. Suddenly he awakened to the fact that there were two Luthers on the pedestal, one of which presently descended to the ground and proceeded to enter the church nearby at the hour of evening service. Naturally he follows and keeps a sharp eye on the resurrected Reformer. After service he learns that it is Luther's desire to enter the active ministry of the Lutheran Church in this country, and that with this purpose in view he intends to apply for ordination to one of the several general bodies.

Filled with interest and curiosity the writer manages to attach himself to Luther as a traveling companion, and goes with him from one body to another until he has made the entire round of all the chief Lutheran bodies in the United States. First, he applies to the General Synod,

then to the United Synod in the South, next to the General Council, next to the German Iowa Synod, then to the Missouri Synod, and finally to the Joint Synod of Ohio. In each case a committee of representative men is appointed to hold a colloquy with the applicant who appears under the name of Brother Martin. In each case the colloquy ends either in the rejection of Brother Martin because he is suspected of unsoundness in the faith, or in Brother Martin himself leaving in disgust because he cannot agree with all the peculiar views of his examiners.

A chapter of the book is devoted to each of these colloquys, and each time another chapter is taken up with the account of Luther's journey from the place of one meeting to the place of the next succeeding meeting. It is from these chapters that the book gets its title: "Little Journeys with Martin Luther." On these journeys he comes into contact with all kinds of people and enters into conversation with them, sometimes into discussion and controversy, over all kinds of questions.

The whole narrative is written in a very bright and entertaining way. But the real interest of the story centers in the fact that the author, or rather the publisher, Rev. Harley, assures us that "in the entire volume there is not a single expression credited to Luther which cannot be found in any standard edition of his works." This is certainly a very remarkable statement in view of the wide range of subjects discussed, and the even wider range of thought and expression. It presents Luther as a truly myriad-minded man, and as being interested in about everything that interests men or concerns either their temporal or their eternal welfare.

The motive of the book is very well expressed by Mr. Harley in his introductory chapter, in which he assures us that "the author was a man of singularly sweet disposition and of mystic turn of mind," and then continues: "If, therefore, he had in mind any other subject than that of recounting a singular experience or relating an interesting story, it was only that which he tacitly avows at the close of the tale, where it is evident that he is under the impression that he has contributed his mite towards a real union of Lutheran forces by exhibiting, in a novel and striking manner, the folly, shame and sin of schism, discord and contention. If such was one of his objects from the outset, he has not gone wide of his mark in the execution of the plan. The folly and sin of schism and withal the foibles of bodies ecclesiastic, have been set forth in a telling and ludicrous manner. No matter how he intended it, he has dealt the devil of schism an effec-

tive blow with his pen. And for that we say, God bless his memory."

We are glad fully to endorse this statement by Mr. Harley. Perhaps he has not in all things been entirely fair in his treatment of the positions taken by the several bodies. It is very possible that in reading the book, the adherents of each synod, or general body, may feel that while the peculiarities and foibles of the other bodies have been very justly exposed and rebuked, his own body has been somewhat misrepresented, or at least its weaknesses exaggerated. This is only natural. But even if there should be some basis for this complaint, it is all done with such bubbling good humor that criticism is disarmed, and no offense can be taken.

We hope that this book may have a wide reading and that its lesson may be taken to heart by many in this quadri-centennial year. What a pity, what a shame, that our great Lutheran Church in this country is split up into so many separate bodies, in some cases at least actually antagonistic to each other. Not only is our unity thus destroyed, but our influence is weakened and our power for good greatly reduced. And why? Simply because none of us are as broad and catholic as was our great Luther. We have heard several readers of Mr. Harley's book say that they believed that it would not be a difficult task to write another book to show by exact quotations from Luther's works that he could feel perfectly at home in any one of the general bodies. This is probably true, and it would seem to be a more gracious task. We hope some one will undertake it. But even if he does, and succeeds as well as "Brother John" has done, the lesson will be the same, only coming from a different angle. It would only serve to give a new and stronger emphasis to "the folly and sin of schism."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

The Books of the Pentateuch. By Frederick Carl Eisele. Pp. 350. Price \$1.50 net.

The influence of the critical spirit of our day is nowhere more evident than in the field of isagogics. Formerly isagogics included a somewhat extended range of subjects in connection with the form and contents of the several books of the Bible, such as archaeology, natural history, geography, as well as date and authorship. Now

the term is limited to the literary criticism of the books alone. A book on Biblical Introduction, we know in advance, deals only with that subject.

The Volume before us is the first of an Old Testament Introduction series of four, projected by the author, three to cover the three divisions of the Hebrew Old Testament, and one to deal with the Canon, the Hebrew text, etc. The author frankly avows his aim as being to set forth the findings of Criticism "in less technical or more popular language and style" than in such works as Driver's or Cornill's, the former of which he seems to accept as his standard of authority.

Prof. Eiselen has succeeded in his purpose to make a book within the comprehension of the average Bible reader. This is accomplished, in part by the author's devoting four chapters to a review of the arguments for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, so that the positions of Criticism are made intelligible by contrast, and also by his simple and untechnical style. The work is orderly and clear and sustains the author's reputation secured by his books on the Prophets. One cannot quarrel with so fair a champion. His temper and moderation will appear from the following summing-up with respect to the Book of the Covenant:

"There is, indeed, nothing in the laws it contains which would make it impossible to assign the code, aside from minor modifications, to the age of the Judges; and in all essentials it may go back to Mosaic decisions, which were adapted to later conditions and, when collected and codified, served as a legal guide until its place was taken by a more advanced code of laws."

But Prof. Eiselen has cast his lot with the Critics, i. e., he has accepted their premises, and their conclusions follow as a matter of course. When it is assumed that the lowest stage of religious manifestation in a people marks the beginning of their religious history, that statutes *follow* practice in the Bible as elsewhere, that a book is not a competent witness in its own behalf, the findings of Criticism are logical enough. But when a theory of the origin of the Pentateuch rests on the assertion that the prophets of the 8th century B. C., such as Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, show no influence of Deuteronomy (and certainly not of the Priest Code) it will not escape challenge. Amos shows such familiarity with the events as related in the Pentateuch, particularly Genesis and Exodus, and with the cultus of the Pentateuch, that for this, among other reasons, moderate critics like Eiselen and Driver, find it necessary to concede that "in its main stock the

legislation of P was not manufactured in the exile" (Dr. 10th ed., p. 143). If this is true, what becomes of Wellhausen's statement: "No trace of P can be found, but, on the other hand, there are clear indications of the ignorance of it?" And if this "main stock" appears in the history of Israel why may not the books of the Pentateuch as they stand represent substantially the manner of its appearance? Few conservative Bible students are so wooden as to make "Mosaic authorship" synonymous with "Mosaic penmanship"; but Mosaic authorship, in a broad sense, still best explains the Old Testament, as it stands, and the New Testament references to it. There are still those who credit the literature of revelation with being veracious.

HERBERT C. ALLEMAN.

YEAR BOOKS.

The Lutheran Church Year Book for 1917, published jointly by the Publication Boards of the General Synod and of the General Council is a handsome paper-bound book of nearly three hundred pages, and sells at 25 cents per single copy. It is the finest and largest year book ever published by our Boards. It is issued under the auspices of the Joint Synod of Ohio, the General Synod, the General Council and the United Synod in the South, and is compiled and edited by the Rev. W. M. Kopenhaver and Miss Grace M. Sheeleigh. It is filled with useful matter such as the usual calendar, a full directory of the church meetings, officers, boards, &c., a complete register of all Lutheran ministers, tables of Church Festivals with appropriate anthems, and also of Sunday School Lessons and Luther League Topics, Statistics, Rates of Postage, and thirty-four pages of reading matter chiefly of a historical character. Every Lutheran family should own this Year Book.

Almanac for the Year 1917, published by the Augustana Book Concern, 32 pages. This year book is full of information, especially for the members of the Augustana Synod, which has grown from 1860 to 1916, from 17 pastors, 36 congregations and 3,747 communicants to 706 pastors, 1207 congregations, and 187,578 communicants.

Der Zionsbote Christlicher Volkskalender auf das Jahr 1917, edited by Rev. Dr. R. Neumann and published by the German Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa, is a

beautiful Year Book in German. The first page of the cover is devoted to a fine picture of Luther, and there are a number of other illustrations scattered through its 160 pages. It contains much useful reading pertaining to Church activities as well as to the history of the Reformation, and to science, &c.

CHRISTIAN HERALD. NEW YORK.

"Luther in the Light of Recent Research," a most remarkable book by Heinrich Boehmer of Marburg University; translated into English by Carl Huth of the University of Chicago was published last year in a handsome edition profusely illustrated, at \$1.50. It was issued by the Christian Herald, N. Y. Recently for the good it will accomplish, the New York Reformation Quadracentenary Committee has published a paper cover edition at the nominal price of 25 cents. A supply of this edition is kept at the headquarters and as long as the edition lasts, it will be furnished from the headquarters at 925 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia. Postage is extra.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is a religious magazine owned and controlled by its editors. It is not, however, to be regarded as their personal organ, neither is it published for private profit but solely in the interests of the Church. It is always open to contributors regardless of denominational affiliation, but its chief purpose is to be the medium for the discussion of theological, religious, historical and social questions from the view-point of the Lutheran Church, especially that portion of it known as the General Synod.

The editors of the QUARTERLY stand firmly and uncompromisingly for the orthodox faith as confessed by the Lutheran Church, and never knowingly publish any article which attacks or discredits the fundamental doctrines or principles of the Christian religion. Within these limits they regard the QUARTERLY as a forum for courteous and scholarly discussion. Without such liberty the truth in its many phases can not be developed.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors who are amenable to the discipline of the Church alone. Neither does the publication of an article mean that they endorse all the views which it presents. Should any of the contributors fall into serious error, or present false and dangerous views, they may and usually will be corrected in subsequent issues by the editors, or by others.

The editors believe that on this basis the QUARTERLY will commend itself to its readers and to all intelligent and thoughtful Lutheran ministers and laymen who are cordially invited to become subscribers.

BASED ON ORIGINAL SOURCES

Luther's Correspondence and Other Contemporary Letters

Translated and Edited by Preserved Smith, Ph. D.

What a wonderful privilege it is to read the private letters of Martin Luther and the active men of Reformation days. These faithful reflections of their innermost lives show their secret feelings, loves, hates, hopes, suspicious, confidences and comments. There is hardly a better way to obtain a clear insight into the causes and effects of the Reformation—it is history at first-hand.

It is also intensely human and with biographical notes and other necessary annotations, sheds much light on this period of Luther's early spiritual struggle, 1507-1521, the time covered by Volume I. Two more volumes are in preparation.

What Non-Lutherans Have Said About It

"It was a happy thought that suggested the publishing of these letters and the great usefulness of the book is evident and will be appreciated by all those who wish to find the inner sources of the Reformation."—Boston Transcript.

"Such books as this should be in the library of every minister and layman interested in the Reformation period."—Reformed Messenger.

"We doubt if there is another American scholar so well fitted to perform the task as Dr. Smith."—The Advance.

"A treasure-house of the sixteenth century originals more than usually accessible and of great value."—English Historical Review, London.

"This is a valuable source-book of the history of the great revolutionary movement of which Luther was the protagonist."—The Outlook.

Isn't it just the book your library needs—just the information and inspiration you need?

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY
1424 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA.

